

The Royal Martyr a True Christian.

OR, A
CONFUTATION
Of a late
ASSERTION,
VIZ.

That King *CHARLES I.*
had only the Lay-Baptism of a
Presbyterian-Teacher :

With an Account of the Government
of the Church of *SCOTLAND*, since
the Reformation ; shewing that Presbytery
is an *INNOVATION* in that Kingdom.

To which is added

A particular Relation of the Solemnity of
King *CHARLES I.* His Baptism from the
Herald's-Office in *EDINBURGH*: And a
PREFACE, in Reply to Mr. *Shaw's* Defence
of the Validity of the Baptisms of Dissenting Mi-
nisters.

By *HENRY CANTRELL, M. A.*
Vicar of St. *Alkmunds, Derby.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for *George Morslock* at the *Phanix*, *Henry Clements* at
the *Half-Moon* in *St. Paul's Church-yard*; and *John Hodges*,
Bookseller in *Derby.* 1716.



THE PREFACE.



THE Occasion of the following Essay is a late Assertion, *viz.* That the blessed Martyr King *Charles I.* of glorious Memory, had no other Baptism than *That* of a Presbyterian Teacher.

When I saw *it first* in print, *it* was, I own, somewhat surprizing to me; and I could not but lament the Misfortune of that Great and Good Man, that He was not regularly admitted a Member of the Church of Christ by a right Administrator of Baptism; but being unwilling to take a Matter of this Importance upon trust, I resolved to enquire into it, and to obtain all possible Satisfaction.

Wherefore, Having, upon Recollection, found, that the present Lord Bishop of *Sarum* had sometime ago plainly approved this Notion^a; [*viz.* that King *James I.* His Children

^a See his Charge at Oxford, 1712. p. 15.

had been baptized by Ministers who had only Presbyterian Orders in *Scotland*,] and Having too with some Concern observed, what ill use had been made of his Lordship's Opinion by our Dissenters, and particularly by an unfair^b Adversary here, with whom I have been engaged in Controversy; I was therefore willing to examine into this Matter; and accordingly I carefully perused the *Scottish History*. And since his Lordship in a marginal Note refers his Readers for the Proof of his Position, *particularly* to Archbishop *Spotswood's History*, from whence it may be concluded, as his Lordship tells us, "That his (*i. e.* King *James's* Children) were so baptized there." I have therefore been so curious as to consider that worthy Author's History, and am humbly of Opinion, that the Inference drawn from thence is not just and well grounded: In a word, I am verily persuaded, that *That* bright Ornament and Martyr of our Church, King *Charles* beforementioned, was baptized by one who had received Episcopal Ordination, by a true authorized Minister of *Jesus Christ*: And if any Man pleases to read the following Discourse, he will see what Grounds there are for my Sentiments in that respect, and I hope will have no Cause to repent his Labour.

I have purposely interwoven an Account of

^b Mr. Shaw a dissenting Teacher in Derby, of the Independent Persuasion, as now appears from his Defence, and especially from what he has weakly urged for a Parochial Episcopacy.

Episcopacy in *Scotland* since the Reformation; for before it, (Episcopacy is proved to be the ancient Government of the Church there, and particularly will clearly appear so from the learned Lord Bishop of *Worcester's Book* ^c on that Subject.) Now my Design in giving that Account is, at once, to rectify the Mistakes of those who believe *Presbytery* to be the ancient Government in *Scotland*; and to vindicate my self and others from the Reflections of some disingenuous Cavillers, who perversely wrest and shamefully misapply what they read to serve a bad Cause, and confirm an Error.

And I am the more concerned to do this, because it has been suggested, that what I briefly observed concerning that Matter in a former Treatise is false in Fact. The Pamphlet which charges me in that manner, and aims at a Confutation, is called, *A Defence of the Baptisms of Dissenting Ministers*; but if one may call it by its proper Name, 'tis a^d Rhapsody rather; an indigested Heap of Quotations from Pamphlets and other modern Writings.

What Mr. *Shaw* has advanced he has stole from other Men's Works, without being so just as to mention his Authors.

^c An Account of the Church Government of Great-Britain. See also the Life of Mr. Sage, printed at London.

^d It treats of so many Particulars different from one another, as Lay-Baptism, Scottish Prelacy, Excommunication, that he could not soon determine what his Title-Page should be; but after he had twice consulted his Brethren at Nottingham, who met upon that occasion, it was carried that it should bear the Title it now appears with. This I can prove to be Fact.

An Evidence this, as full as can be, of his being a *gross* Plagiary. What may be called his *own* is his Prefatory Dedication to the Corporation of *Derby*, which is stuff'd with the most fulsom Flattery of his Patrons, and a nauseous Commendation of himself; of his great Moderation, and inoffensive Behaviour since he came hither: His Language too, **foul** and **unmannerly** as *that* of Fish-women; his Blunders, Inconsistencies and Contradictions, which are many; his false Reasonings, and perverse Wrestings, and Misapplications of his Adversaries Words; his confident Assertions, and in short, his downright Falshoods are his *own*; and I can hardly suppose any Man but Mr. *Shaw*, capable of being guilty of 'em.

Let any impartial, and unprejudic'd Person but read his Performance, and I dare engage he will, *must* indeed, acknowledge, that he has given no new Light to the Controversy; nay, he cannot but conclude, that *that* Cause is bad, that needs Heat and Ill-language to support it.

When I heard that Mr. *Shaw* designed to be an Author, I promis'd my self he would mind the Argument, and endeavour to convince the Reason. But 'tis plain that *that* was the least part of *his* Concern; for from the beginning to the end, there is scarce a Page without Invective and Abuse. Personal Reflections fill his Book, and blot both sides of his Paper.

The Clergy, the Liturgy of the Church of
Eng-

England, the blessed Martyr King *Charles*, have some of his awkward "*silly fears*;" and his Adversaries are represented as Popishly affected, and Enemies to the Happiness of their Countrey. A Charge as old as Fanaticism, and as false as the Conventicle Worship. In one word, he has treated his Answerers with the utmost Rudeness and Contempt.

Since he pretends to be a Scholar, and a Minister of the Gospel, it might reasonably have been expected, that we should have met with more Civility from him; we have all had the Happiness and Honour of an University Education, which he never had; we have taken those Degrees he has no Title to; (altho' he conceitedly styles himself *M. A.*) and two of us, Mr. *Harris* and my self are in holy Orders; and for *that* Reason alone, have a Right to a better Treatment; and for the Honour of Religion in general, and in Obedience to the Precepts of the Gospel, he should not have given us railing Language. According to his own false Notion, [*viz.* Bishop and Presbyter are the same,] he must acknowledge *us* to be Ministers of Christ; and if so, how flatly contrary is his Practice to several plain Texts of Scripture, when he gives us such opprobrious Names, as "*Hereticks*," "*Schismatics*," doubly perjur'd Persons, "Men of no Sincerity, unchristian, uncharitable, impudent, insolent, impertinent; whose Discourses are uncharitable, unedifying, damning, bordering upon Blasphemy," and the like. This proceeds from

the moderate, the meek, the charitable, the inoffensive Mr. Shaw^c, who styles himself a Presbyter of the Church of Christ; and after all this foul Language, wipes his Mouth, and has the face to say in his last Page, viz. 113. that he expects the Reply to his Pamphlet shall be “no otherwise than in the Spirit of “Meekness,” and then adds, “that he sets “a greater Value upon his precious Time, and “upon the much greater Good that he hopes “to do otherwise, than to afford it [*i. e.* a “Reply that is not meek] an Answer.”

Quistulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes!
Juv.

Thus much may suffice to shew the Spirit of the Man, and much more will be evident to any one that will give himself the trouble of reading his Performance.

How provoking soever his Treatment is, I can easily bear and forgive it. And whatever his Design was in it, (which is not difficult to be guess'd) he has certainly miss'd it; he has deriv'd upon himself the Disgrace he hop'd to brand us with; and all Men of Sense condemn him as a weak, hot-headed, and unmannerly Writer.

But not to insist upon his indecent Behaviour, which really deserves our Pity, I now apply my self to consider the most material Passages of his Works; and submit my Remarks to the Consideration of the Reader.

^c See his Dedication and Title-Page.

And

And first, as to what he has said concerning the Validity of Lay-Baptism, it may suffice to observe, that he has chiefly collected it from those Authors that have wrote on *that* side of the Question; so that he has given no new Light to the Controversy, as any one may plainly see, that compares their Writings together. And at the same time that he transcrib'd from them, he might have remembered that the very Arguments he borrow'd, were clearly baffled, and demonstratively confuted by the excellent Answers which were then publish'd. Besides too, it should have been remembred, that I had urg'd many Particulars against his first Performance, which he entirely passes over without any Consideration, tho' in the Judgment of Men as learned as himself, it was unavoidably incumbent on him to have done it.

But to what purpose is it to argue upon that Point, when Mr. S. himself has fairly given up the Cause, as all judicious Men will, I suppose, allow he does, when they read his own Words. For speaking of the * *Hampton Court Conference* he says thus. “The “King thought, that the *former Rubrick* “did allow, or however, *Countenance Lay-* “baptism, of which he declared his utter “dislike, and therefore commanded the Al- “terations to be made. Since which time “it must be owned, that the Church of *Eng-* “land does require a lawful Minister to be

* P. 28. Defence.

“ the

“ the Administrator of Baptism, who is the
 “ *only* authoriz’d Person by this Rubrick to
 “ do it: --Wherefore, Since this Point is thus
 plainly granted, it must, I think, follow by a
 natural and necessary Consequence, that that
 Baptism which is not administred by a lawful
 Minister, “ who is the only authorized Per-
 “ son by this Rubrick to do it” (as Mr. S.
 confesses) is not, cannot be valid in the *Judg-*
ment of the Church of England.

And now the *Hampton Court Conference*
 has been mentioned, it may not be amiss in
 this place to take notice of that scandalous
 Imputation ^f Mr. S. fixes upon Dr. Barlow’s
 account of that Conference.

Mr. S. being sensible, that according to the
 Doctor’s Account, the Puritanical Party were
 perfectly baffled, is therefore pleased to dis-
 grace it as much as possible, and accordingly
 affirms with his usual Confidence, that it “ is
 “ justly suspected of great Partiality.”

Which in other Words amounts to this.
 Dr. Barlow was an insincere Writer, one
 that asserted Falshoods, and published Lyes
 to disparage the PURITANS.

But that Mr. Shaw’s charge against the
 Doctor is a *Calumny*, will be evident to any
 Candid, and impartial Person that will be at
 the Pains to compare Dr. Barlow’s Account
 with the King’s Proclamation. †

^f P. 27, 28.

† It was issued out March the 5th, 1603-4.

Now by *that*, it plainly appears that the
Puritans misrepresented and misreported
 Matters of FACT^g, and endeavoured to per-
 suade the World, that they had the Advan-
 tage in that Controversy; in order therefore
 to undeceive some, and Antidote others a-
 gainst their infectious Lies, His Majesty
 thought it becoming Him to let the People
 know that they were imposed upon by those
 Schismatical Innovators, and that the Advo-
 cates of the Church had fully and clearly an-
 swered their vain Cavils, and weak Objectons.

But what tends to the farther clearing
 the Doctor’s Reputation is the Consideration,
 that He was look’d upon to be a Person of that
 great Sincerity, that the Archbishop of *Can-*
terbury ^h [Dr. Whitgift] enjoyn’d him that
 task, which ’tis not reasonable to suppose
 that good Prelate would have done, if he had
 in the least suspected his Honesty.

That the Doctor’s Account (of the first
 Day especially, when the matter of Baptism
 was discussed) had the Approbation of those
 who very well knew the Particulars of that
 Controversy, is plain from his own Words.
 “ Some ⁱ says he, of good Place and Under-
 “ standing have seen it, and not controlled
 “ it”.

In a Word, the Account he gives of the

^g See Mr. Collier’s *Ecclesiastical History*, 2 Vol. p. 683,
 684, a.

^h Dr. Barlow’s *Preface*, p. 1.

ⁱ See *Preface*. p. 3, 4.

two last Days, is agreeable with the Copies^k of the Bishop of *London*, the Deans of *Christ-Church, Winchester, Windsor*, the Archdeacon of *Nottingham*, and his own.

And could not all these Copies set “ this matter in a truer Light, than Mr. *Pat. Galloway*’s account ” could pretend to do, which Mr. *S.* so much applauds, and prefers before them ?

Had the Dean of *Chester* retain’d a regard only for his own Reputation, he would never have falsify’d his account, because there were many then living that could easily have detected his Falshoods.

And the Reverend Persons before-mentioned, whose Copies he made use of, as well as his own, would, doubtless, have resent a Misrepresentation, as an abuse of themselves, as well as an Imposition upon the World.

But he was so fully satisfy’d concerning the Truth of his Relation, that in his Epistle to the Reader, he says, “ the TRUTH THEREOF “^l shall be justified ”: And yet he was at the same time sensible, that his Account would not agree with^m “ *some Accounts which were scattered, and sent abroad;* ” and the reason was, not because his was not

^k “ For the two last, out of divers (a) Copies I have selected and ordered what you here see ”, p. 4.

(a) Ep. Londi. { Christ-Church, } Archdeacon of Not-
Deans of { Winchester, } tingham, and my
{ Windsor. } own.

^l Preface, p. 5.

^m Preface, p. 5.

genuine, but because (as he himself expresses it *,) “ *some of them were partial, some untrue, and some slanderous.* ”

In which of these Classes, Mr. *S.* will place *Galloway*’s Account, he has his Liberty. That it is partial, false, and slanderous in many Particulars, will be plain upon the Comparison.

In short, it so exactly agrees with those Misrepresentations, or false Copies of the *Puritans* the Doctor has subjoined to his Account, that one would be tempted to believe, that they were all wrote by the same Person ; however, by Men of the same Schismatical Temper, who industriously handed them about to support a bad Cause, and to blast all Hopes of Unity.

And by this time it may be hoped I have sufficiently justified a Gentleman who being long since dead, cannot justify himself from that base Calumny Mr. *S.* endeavoured to blacken him with.

I proceed now to consider another heavy charge which relates to myself, viz. “ That “ I scandalously trade in Falshood and Slander ”ⁿ, and particularly that “ I begin my “ Preface with an impudent Falshood ”, and that my “ Book has its very Foundation in “ Falshood and Inconsistence ”, and that it consists of false Quotations, &c.

* Preface, p. 5.

ⁿ See his Defence, p. 9. p. 83 Marg.

To which scandalous Accusation, I hope I may be allowed to say (without being thought immoderate) that it is false and groundless, and that the Language is very unbecoming a Gentleman that pretends so much to good Manners and Moderation. How easy a thing is it to give hard Names! And how obvious to observe that the Dissenters never fail to play this sort of Artillery upon us for want of solid Argument!

Heat and ill Language are the Characteristics of some Men's Writings, and remove but these and little else is to be found in them.

But what is it gives occasion for this abusive Language! Why it seems I was so provoking as to say, that "it is agreed on all Hands both by the Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, and their Opponents in this Controversy, that the Dissenting Teachers in this Kingdom are no more than Laymen, &c. And is it not very certain, that the Writers on that Subject (whom I had then in my Eye) are of that Opinion?

That the Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-baptism, do look upon Mr. S. and his Brethren to be meer Laymen, for want of Episcopal Ordination, is evident from their Writings, beyond all Possibility of Dispute.

And as for Mr. Bingham, and others of our Church who maintain the other side of the Question, it is plain, that they are also, in *that* respect, of the same Judgment.

^p See Preface of the Invalidity, &c.

Mr. Bingham in his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, proves the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, and clearly makes appear, that Ordinations by Presbyters were disannulled by the Church of Christ in the most Primitive and Purest Ages.

The present Lord Bishop of *Sarum*, speaking of the Lay-baptisms of the Dissenting Teachers, has these very memorable Words.

"Am I pleading for these irregular Practices, or justifying these intruding Administrators? God forbid: *Fieri non debet*, these things ought not to be, and they will be answerable to God, and his Church, who usurp an Office to which they were not called. All that I contend for, is, *Factum valet*". And again, "we are blessed, God be praised for it, with a Church truly Primitive and Apostolical in her Doctrine, Discipline and Worship, and in her whole Constitution: And we cannot too highly prize our Happiness in being Members of her".

At the Visitation here, which Mr. S. refers to *p.* 94. the Right Reverend Lord Bishop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry* freely acknowledged, that he looked upon the Dissenting Teachers to be meer Laymen. For when I argued with that Deference due from a Presbyter to his Diocesan, that their Bap-

^p See *V.* 1. *p.* 49 to 91.

^q See his Lordship's Charge at Oxford, 1712. from which Mr. Shaw makes very large Quotations.

risms were invalid, because They were not ordained by his Lordship, or some other of his Colleagues, he made no scruple to own (to his Lordship's Honour I speak it) that they were not authorized Ministers; But yet, he was of Opinion, that their Baptisms were valid, in which last Point, the whole Body of his Clergy then present, five only excepted*, dissented from him. They did not think

* Mr. Wilson Rector of Morley, and now Archdeacon of Coventry, pressed me with this powerful, and convincing Argument, "What is become of those that were baptized in *Oliver's Days*"? Which, with Submission to his Age and Dignity, is nothing to the purpose. One might reasonably have expected from a Dignitary, a stronger Argument, but I suppose the Cause would afford no better. Mr. Allop, Rector of Boylston, argued for the Validity of Lay-baptism, only in Cases of absolute Necessity, which, by the way, is not our Dissenters Case. Mr. Tatum, Vicar of Sutton, joined his assent, but gave no reason for it. The other two were French Refugees, viz. Mr. Labonneile, Rector of Brailesford, and Mr. Grognet, Minister of Okebrooke; the former offered for an Argument, an Historical account of the Controversy between St. Cyprian Bishop of Carthage, and Stephen Bishop of Rome. But his Lordship shortened his History, by telling him, it was nothing to the purpose. The Argument of the latter was, and still is, that Presbyterian Ordination is valid, but denies that our Dissenting Teachers are Ministers, and yet argues for the Validity of their Baptisms. Strange Inconsistence! but if Presbyterian Ordination be valid, I beg leave to remind Mr. Grognet (as I have often done), of the present Bishop of Worcester's Question to him, when Bishop of this Diocese. "Monsieur, if Presbyterian Ordination be valid, as you affirm it is, if by Virtue thereof you received the Commission of a Minister of Christ, why did I ordain you"?

In a Word, Both these French Protestants seemed to have forgot, to say no worse, the Determinations of their own Synods, which utterly condemn Lay-baptism. See my Invalidity, &c. where I quote their Acts of Synod from the Synodicon of Mr. Quick, a Dissenting Teacher.

that

that the Argument *Quod fieri non debet*, &c. which his Lordship urged, was at all conclusive.

It were easy to give many more Instances of the Clergy and Laity, both High and Low, according to that unhappy Distinction, who are verily persuaded that the Dissenters are involved in a very grievous Schism; particularly for separating from the Communion of the Bishops, the Principles of Unity; and setting up, and adhering to, such, as Pastors, who never received a true Commission.

And as for those who are such *Latitudinarians* in their Principles as to think, and say otherwise, I shall only tell 'em, that I am sorry there should be any such amongst us; and if they please to inform themselves, I doubt not, they may be satisfied that their Notions are contrary to all Antiquity^r, and the express Doctrines of the Church of *England* they pretend to be Members of.

And by this time, it may be hop'd, all ingenuous Persons see in what Sense my Assertion is to be understood, and that it is apparent, that "it is agreed on all Hands, both by the Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-baptism, and their Opponents in this Controversy, that the Dissenting Teachers in this Kingdom are no more than Lay-men; and consequently my Work has not its Foundation in Falshood and Inconsistence."

^r See St. Ignatius, St. Cyprian, and others. See the Preface before the Office of Ordination, and the Canons of our Church.

And had it pleas'd Mr. *Shaw* to have read my Work without prejudice, (to say no worse of it) he might plainly see from what I immediately add after this Assertion, that I mean those Persons that have controverted the Point of Lay-baptism.

That I do not deserve the Character of one that "scandalously trades in Falshood and Slander," in reference to what I said, p. 76. [Invalidity, &c.] will, I doubt not, be very manifest to any candid Person that consults the Books I mention.

I asked why the most learned Mr. *Dodwell* must be styl'd a "Corrupter of the Faith and Church," and be termed, almost an Atheist, for asserting what the famous Mr. *Milton*, Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Robert Fleming* have done before.

Now whether *they* were not as *faulty* as Mr. *Dodwell*; whether they did not deserve as severe a Censure must be determin'd by their Writings I referr'd to.

But if Mr. *Shaw* will not, or cannot, read and understand 'em, the Fault is his, and not mine.

However, the impartial Reader will, I doubt not, upon comparing 'em together, see which of us is to be blam'd; whether he, that confidently affirms, "he can find nothing in these Authors like what Mr. *Dodwell* is charg'd with;" and that, "they say no

¹ See *Milton's Paradise lost. Fol. Edit. p. 131, 132.*

Baxter's dying Thoughts. Lond. Edit. p. 32, 139, 145.

Fleming's Christology. Lond. Edit. p. 65.

"such thing;" or I, that have pointed out the very Passages, (but because I study Brevity do not *now* transcribe 'em) and could have added more to the same Purpose.

So that upon the whole Matter, were I dispos'd to imitate this Gentleman's good Manners, I might return his Complement, and ask him, "What regard is to be had to an Author who thus scandalously trades in Falshood and Slander?" But I forbear to recriminate, tho' it be so easy.

The next thing I take notice of is his Charge of Nonsense, which, by the way, shews our Author's profound Skill in *Criticism*, and may possibly be an Advantage to the Reader. This "quick-sighted" Gentleman has discover'd, that I once wrote "ye instead of you;" and therefore makes this *shrewd* Remark, *viz.* "that every School Boy knows it's Nonsense." To which I answer, (if the Reader will pardon me for answering a Trifle) That had this Critick been better read, even in *English* Writers, he might have made this Observation, that they often use "ye instead of you."

^v Bishop *Beveridge*, whom our Author vouchsafes to quote upon occasion; the present Archbishop of *York*; the Bishop of *Rochester*,

a 2

² *Def. p. 64.*

^v *Bishop Beveridge's Sermons.*

Bishop of York's Duties of the Closet, p. 2.

Bishop of Rochester's Sermon before the Sons of the Clergy, passim.

chester, and Dean Kennett: Sir Roger L'Estrange also in his Dissenters Sayings, take the very same liberty; not to mention many others. That *ye* is put for *you* is obvious in our *English* Bibles; but perhaps that Translation is too old, and the Language not refin'd enough for so polite an Author. The Directory, it may be, he will allow to be as good Authority as any, let him turn then to the 26th page of it, and he will find, that his Forefathers thought *ye* would do as well as *you*. But why do I stay to shew the Folly of a Criticism that really deserves no Consideration?

How sadly was our Author distress'd for Argument, when he is thus forc'd to turn Caviller, and makes a groundless, idle Criticism, which proves rather *his* Nonsense, and not *mine*; and which, instead of shewing my Ignorance, sufficiently exposes his own.

But since he delights so much in Criticism, I ask how it comes to pass that he "falls into "Nonsense and wretched Blundering?" Why was not such a judicious Critick more correct than to repeat such Faults for which a "School "Boy would be whipp'd?" And what those Faults are, he may observe as *critically* as he pleases in the Margin^w.

As

Dean Kenner's Sermon on Rebellion.

Sir Roger L'Estrange's Dissenters Sayings. Part 2. 2^d Edit. Printed 1681. Epist. Ded. p. 2, l. 14, 27. p. 3. l. 2, 6, 14, &c. p. 5, 8, 9, & passim.

Directory, p. 26.

^w Not to insist upon the mistake of Writing Amphibales for Amphibalus, Pallidies for Palladius, &c. for Canons of the

As to his very earnest Desire to convince the World that he is a Master of Arts, and has not arrogantly, and undeservedly assum'd that Title, (as many affirm he has done) I shall not quarrel with him about it; let it be suppos'd (to please him) that he commenc'd in 1693^x, when (as he most *wittily* expresses it) Mr. C. "was but eight Years and five "Months old," (so exact is our Chronologer's Calculation;) when, (for the *sterling Wit* continues) "he being a forward Child, "might by that time be in *Sententia*," (he meant *Sententiæ*.) Let, I say, all this be suppos'd; I only observe, that in the first place it is nothing to the Purpose, nor in the least concerns our Argument. Secondly, That the Seminary of *Sheriff-Hales* had no Authority to confer Degrees, the Laws having allow'd only the two Universities (which God preserve) that Privilege.

But however this be, in the mean time certain it is, that Grammar is a part of those liberal Arts, of which Mr. *Shaw* pretends to be a Master; but whether false Spelling, and

the Church, he writes *Cannons*; for *Rites or Ceremonies, Rights*. The passage of Isaac Casaubon, viz. * Baptisum esse pronuncians, which he found in Mr. Bingham's Book†, he construes thus: We pronounce and "Does not every School-Boy know it's Non-sense"?

And again, p. 98. speaking of *Sententiæ Pueriles*; by a Figure peculiar to himself, he calls the Book *Sententia*, Fancying perhaps, that it was but one intire Sentence from the beginning to the end of it.

^x Def. 98.

* Def. p. 30.

† P. 133. and in the Margin of the Bp. of Oxford's Charge.

false Concord, and using the singular Number instead of the plural, be consistent with good Grammar, may deserve the Consideration of our Critick.

As to many other Particulars, I am of the Opinion that they are as much to the purpose as his Criticism.

What relation, for example, is there between Episcopacy, and Mr. *Cantrell's* ^y marrying a Couple in *Lent*? What has Excommunication by ^z Lay-Chancellors to do with our Subject?

What reason is there for telling a long hearsay Story, that some Clergymen wrote the ^a Pamphlets which represent the Injuries of the Burgeses of *Derby*, and exemplify the Particulars? Is this any thing to Lay-Baptism? Does it evidently prove that our Dissenting Teachers can administer valid Baptisms?

What! if some Persons of Mr. *Shaw's* Principles did not like those Parts of my Book re-

^y Let Mr. Shaw shew the Rubrick or Canon that forbids a Minister to marry Persons in *Lent*. See Dr. Brett's Considerations on Marriage.

^z The Chancellor's Court enquires into Misdemeanors, and makes Reports that such a Person has incur'd Excommunication for his Obstinacy and contempt of Authority, which are certainly great Sins, and then the Sentence is pronounced by a Priest, and afterwards denounced by the Priest or Minister of the Parish, where the Delinquent lives.

Thus Mr. Shaw may be pleas'd to observe, that this charge too upon Lay-Chancellors, &c. is false and groundless.

^a 'Tis well known that they were not written by any Clergyman.

lating to Baptism and Episcopacy; does it therefore follow that he is a Minister, and his Ministrations valid? What! if my "Book cost me five Months Study," as he says it did, is it ever the worse for that? Or is his the better for being drawn up in haste, that he might appear an expeditious Writer?

What! if *Eleanor Pead* the Midwife swore* to administer Baptism in the time of Necessity, with the right Matter and Form; is it a Consequence that the Church of *England* now allows^b a Midwife, or other Lay-Person, to baptize; and especially when there is no Necessity for doing so?

What occasion was there for that long Quotation from the late Bishop of *Salisbury's* mournful^c Preface? How did his scandalous Reflection upon the Clergy, and Universities, any way concern the Points in Controversy between us?

As to the many Passages Mr. *Shaw* has transcrib'd from Archbishop *Tillotson's* Sermons, it may be truly observ'd that they are nothing to his Purpose; because the Charge of Uncharitableness cannot justly be fix'd upon me. I have sufficiently express'd my Charity for those that differ from me^d, and especially for those that have not had an Opportu-

* Anno, 1567.

^b There is no such Oath administered now to Midwives as Mr. Shaw may inform himself at Doctor's Commons, or at the other Courts Christian.

^c See an answer to that Preface printed, 1713.

^d See my Invalidity of Lay-Baptisms, &c.

nity of receiving true Baptism^e: In short, according to the Advice of that great Prelate before-mention'd, I endeavour to "enlarge the
 " Kingdom of Christ as much as I can, and I
 " extend my Charity to all Churches, and Christians of what Denomination soever, AS FAR
 " AS REGARD TO TRUTH AND THE FOUNDATION
 " OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION WILL PERMIT
 " ME TO BELIEVE, AND HOPE WELL OF THEM."

As for Mr. *Shaw's* positive Assertion in one place, and Insinuations in others, that I made false Quotations, I have already prov'd him guilty of a base Slander, by pointing out the very Passages I referr'd to in *Milton, Baxter* and *Fleming's* Writings, and could have added more to the same Purpose, were it necessary. Did he find that I had misquoted any thing from Mr. *Quick's Synodicon*? Did I not plainly shew that the Reform'd abroad in their several Synods of *Poitiers, Rochel, Gap, Languedoc*, condemn'd Lay-Baptism?

Have I not prov'd that *Calvin*, and the Brethren of *Geneva*, call'd it *counterfeit Baptism, a meer Mockery, a Profanation of the Sacrament of Baptism, an apish Trick, an Ape of Baptism, and Mock-baptism*? Did I not observe that it was condemn'd by the *Kirk of Scotland*, by the Presbyterians in *England*, and by Mr. *Edwards* in his *Gangrena*? And I add now, was it not condemn'd by the Puri-

^e See Remarks on the late Bp. of Sarum's Sermons at Salisbury, where the Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism are vindicated with respect to the charge of Uncharitableness.

tans at the *Hampton-Court-Conference*? Were not the Words *LAWFUL MINISTER* order'd to be insert'd by way of Explanation^s to gratify them?

To return. Did Mr. *Shaw* find, when he consulted the Fathers, whether *Greek* or *Latin*, which I quoted, that I had perverted their Sense, and abus'd their Meaning? I dare say he did not; nay, I am sure he *could* not detect me in any such unfair Practice; no, not with the Help of his *Lexicon*, and the Assistance of his more learned Friends.

Let me therefore caution him for the future, not to make false Charges, if he has any regard to his Reputation.

I will trouble the Reader but with one thing more that is Personal, and that is a palpable Falshood, with reference to my Father's Baptism. If Lay-Baptism be invalid, Mr. *Shaw* " recommends it to me to perform the Duty
 " of a Son, by persuading my Father to receive Baptism at my Hands." For, as Mr. *Shaw* tells the World, he was born " in
 " the Parish of *Austen-field* in *Staffordshire*
 " in the Year 1658; Mr. *Gawen Hamilton*
 " at that time Incumbent." Who, as he observes, came from *Scotland*; and was, in short, as may be collected from his Words, not Episcopally ordain'd.

To all which I answer: That my Father

^f See Nicholls's Defence of the Doctrine, &c. of the Church of England, p. 42. See Hampton-Court Conference.

^g Mr. Collier's Ecclesiastical History, 2 v. p. 682. b.

was not born at *Alstonfield*, nor in any part of that Parish^h. He was never in that Parish till he was fifteen Years old. And suppose he had been born there, and baptiz'd by Mr. *Hamilton*, it is not a Consequence that he was "unepiscopally baptiz'd," for the following Reasons; 1st. Because Mr. *Hamilton* (as his Relations and Neighbours affirm) was persecuted by the Presbyterian Party in the grand Rebellion against King *Charles I.* and was forc'd to lie in the Fields all Night, not daring to lodge at home. 2^d. Because he was educated at the University of *Oxford*; so that 'tis probable, he had receiv'd a true Episcopal Ordination.

But to end this Dispute. His Son, who was the late Vicar of *Thorpe*, declar'd, that his Father, whom Mr. *Shaw* mentions, was Episcopally ordain'd. For the Truth of which, and other Particulars, I have a Letter of Attestation, which some of Mr. *Shaw's* Friends have, to their great Mortification, seen; and can produce other Authorites, if the thing requir'd it.

In a Word, that my Father was not born at *Alstonfield*, and that Mr. *Shaw* was not "assur'd from the Register" he was so, as he positively and falsely asserts he was, will, I doubt not, be manifest from the following Certificate.

^h *Wetton*, which our Author (as I hear) now fixes upon as the place of his Nativity, is not in that Parish, nor was my Father baptized by Mr. *Hamilton*; Mr. *Shaw* must therefore search some other Register more Authentick than the former.

Whereas Mr. *Shaw*, a Dissenting Teacher in *Derby*, has affirm'd in a late Pamphlet entituled, [A Defence of the Validity of the Baptisms of Dissenting Ministers] that he is assur'd from the Register of *Alstonfield* in *Staffordshire*, that Mr. *Cantrell's* Father had no other than the Baptism of a Dissenting Presbyterian Teacher:

I Peter Parre, Vicar of *Alstonfield*, do hereby certify and declare, that his Assertion is false and groundless:

For upon a diligent Search, and Consultation of the Register, there is no such Person as Mr. *Cantrell's* Father registred there, neither in the Year 1658, (the Year Mr. *Shaw* refers to) nor in any other. And I do farther certify, and declare, that the said Register is, and has been always, in my Custody, since I became Vicar there; and that neither Mr. *Shaw*, nor any other Person for him, ever did consult it; so that what Mr. *Shaw* asserts on this account, is a Falshood.

In Testimony of the Truth of the Premises, I have hereunto set my Hand this 13th Day of October, 1715.

Peter Parr, Vic. de *Alstonfield*.

Sign'd in the Presence of
Antho. Blackwall, Vic. de *Elvaston*.
Tho. Wood, Rect. of *Keyworth*.
Higgins Harris, Minister of
St. Peters, Derby.

What Remarks might be made upon our Author's Veracity, Sincerity, and such like excellent Qualities, are so obvious to every Reader, that my Labour is intirely superseded. I shall therefore only ask Mr. *Shaw* at parting, what he thinks of a Man that is thus trifling and inconsistent? Or (to use his own Words) "what regard is to be had to an Author that thus scandalously trades in Falshood?"

We have been often told of a new Edition of his Defence, with a recommendatory Preface from three of his Brethren, Mr. *Tong*, Dr. *Oldfield*, Mr. *Robinson*.

These, I suppose, are to give some mighty *Encomiums* upon our Author's Performances; and he again, in return, is to do as much for them when there is occasion. Thus they receive Honour one of another.

One great Reason, as I am inform'd, they give of the Excellency of his Defence, is this, *viz.* "That in five Months time seven hundred and fifty Books were bought by the charitable and moderate Men of all sides in the neighbouring Counties."

An Assertion this, notoriously false; for the Booksellers have at this very time a great many which cannot be sold; and one that has as much reason to know the Sale of the Book as any Man, says expressly, "that this Assertion is a Lye."

ⁱ Def. p. 83. Marg.

But to return.

I have more than once enquir'd for this Preface at Mr. *Shaw's* Bookfellers, but cannot yet obtain it; and therefore it cannot be imagin'd, that I should make any Remarks upon a Recommendatory Preface; which, tho' it has been much talk'd of, and long expected, is not publish'd.

To Mr. *Shaw's* Accusation of the Clergy, that when they preach concerning Schism, they "damn the Dissenters", &c. it may at present suffice to say; that when we discourse of Schism, (as doubtless all Clergymen ought to do in the Course of their Preaching, and whenever they see Occasion) we say the very same things of the Sinfulness and Damning Nature of it, which ^k the Holy Scriptures, the ^l Primitive Fathers (particularly

^k *Unity is recommended by our Blessed Saviour, St. John, c. 17. v. 21, 22, 23. & v. 4, 5, of the same Chapter.*

Schism condemned, Rom. c. 16. v. 17. 1 Cor. c. 1. v. 10. 1 Cor. c. 3. v. 3. 2 Cor. c. 13. v. 11. Ephes. c. 4. v. 3. Philip. c. 1 v. 27. Philip. c. 2. v. 1, 2. St. Jude v. 19. 1 Cor. c. 8. v. 1. Ephes. c. 2. v. 21, 22. Ephes. c. 4. v. 16. Coloss. c. v. 2. 19. 2 Tim. c. 4. v. 3. 2 Pet. c. 2. v. 10. Galat. c. 5. v. 20, 21.

^l *Clemens Romanus. Epist. ad Corinth. St. Ignatius Epist. particularly ad Eph. §. 5, 20. 4, 13. Epist. ad Trall. §. 7. Epist. ad Magnes. §. 6, 7. Epist. ad Philadel. §. 2, 4, 7, 8. Epist. ad Smyr. §. 8. Epist. ad Polycarp. §. 6.*

Cypriani Epist. ad Cornelium 45, 46. ad Florent. 59, 16. Cyprianus de Unitate Ecclesiæ. See Euseb. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 6.

The Canons of the Apostles, Can. 24. according to Cotelierius's Division: Canon Gang. Anno 340. See Can. 6. or 65. according to another Division. African Code Can. 10, 11, &c.

St. Ignatius, and St. Cyprian), and even the^m Old Nonconformists have said concerning it.

We assert that Schism is a Sin, as well as Adultery, or Murder, and all Sin doubtless is in its Nature *Damnable*; but what Allowances a God of infinite Mercy will make, to those who Labour under an invincible Ignorance, or the Prejudices of Education, we pretend not to determine. For my own particular, when I discourse upon Schism, and such like Subjects which the guilty do not care to hear of, I never fail to tell 'em the whole Truth, and to shew the natural and dreadful Consequences of Sin.

But then I do it in the most inoffensive and endearing manner I can think of; in such a manner as may evince that I have a real respect for their Persons, and a tender Compassion for their Souls. So that in the very doing it, they may observe, that it is my

† Lon. E-^m That Schism is condemned as a damnable Sin
dit. 1670. by the Dissenting Teachers: See † Mr. Baxter's Cure of Church-Divisions, Pref. p. 2, 6. "Church-Division is an Heap of Sin", and p. 11. See his Treatise of Self-denial. See Dr. Bryan's Dwelling with God, p. 313, 314. See Vindication of Presbyterian Government and Ministry, published by the Ministers, and Elders of London, met together in a Provincial Synod, as they call it, Nov. 2. 1649. See two Sticks made one, or the Excellency of Unity, A Sermon preached by Mr. Mead, April 6. 1691. and printed at the request of above Fourscore Dissenting Teachers of the Presbyterian and Independent Persuasions. To these I might add, Ball, Hildertham, Brightman, Paget, and many others who severely condemn Schism, but am unwilling to enlarge these Papers.

con-

concern for their eternal Salvation, that urges me to foreprize 'em of their Danger.

In a Word, certain it is, that that Man can never be accounted a faithful Minister of Jesus Christ, that does not "declare the whole Counsel of God", if he *Prophecies only smooth Things, if he Prophecies Deceit*; if he suits his Doctrine to the taste of the Times, and calls evil Good, and good Evil; he must necessarily, even in *this* Life, feel the terrible Rebukes of his own Conscience, and has but too much reason too fear that Woe and Misery denounced, and reserved for those *Cruel Pastors*, "*Whocry Peace, Peace when there is no Peace*". Jer. 6. 14.

As for those particulars which have no Relation to our Dispute, I suppose, I might, without Imputation, take no notice of them. But because Mr. Shaw and his Admirers may interpret my Silence, as an Argument that they are unanswerable, I will therefore bestow a Remark or two upon them in the Marginⁿ.

If

ⁿ One Argument our † Author offers, to prove me disaffected to our late good Queen of Blessed Memory, and a Friend to the Pretender, is my giving the Epithets of Reverend, Judicious, Learned, Pious or Worthly, &c. to Dr. Hicks, Mr. Dodwell, Mr. Lesley, &c. when I had occasion to mention them, and their Writings. In answer to which, I say, that at this rate of reasoning; he that in civil terms quotes a passage from Baxter or Mariana, must be a Presbyterian, or a Papist; and there is just the same Reason to infer from Mr. Shaw's quoting so many long Passages from the Sermons of Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Burnet, &c. that he is a Member of the Church of England. In a Word, when Mr.

† Defence, p. 82, 83, 84.

Shaw

If I be thought too Minute and Punctual in my Answers, beyond the Merit of the Ob-

Shaw pleases to write as well in Vindication of Truth and Religion, and for the Advancement of Human Learning as they have done, (and who can doubt his Abilities?) then I will not scruple to give him too the same Epithets, the same "great Marks of Respect and Esteem".

And yet I hope no Body will be so absurd as to infer from thence, that I am either a Republican, or a Presbyterian. Could he have proved that I had preached up Resistance and Rebellion against her, or by seditious Words, or disloyal Actions had evidenced a dislike of her Administration; then, I own, I had justly deserved the severest Censure. But since nothing so wicked and inconsistent with my Oaths could ever be objected, even by this Accuser, against me; I presume therefore, there is no Person that is truly Candid and Charitable, but must condemn him for charging me with want of "Allegiance to her Majesty, and Duty to my Diocesan", with being "a Favourer of the Pretender", and "doubly perjured". But after all, supposing the Charge to be just, would it become Mr. Shaw to upbraid me with it, whose

Separation is one continued, avowed Act of Disobedience to * Authority, both in Church and State! How ridiculous is it in Him to tax any Man with Disloyalty, who, (not to mention his Principles of Resistance which are inconsistent with Government) was so disrespectful to the late Queen, to say no worse, so much an Enemy to the Hanover Succession, that (when the News was sent by the Faction to Derby about a Month before Christmas that she was then dead, which happily proved a Falshood, he was so far from being concerned at it, that

on the contrary, he had Company in the Evening very merry with him, and to shew how well pleased he was with the report, he could not forbear coming out into the Street, where he bawl'd out a Marlborough, a Marlborough, forgetting, it seems, the next Heir, the Crown was entail'd upon by Law.

This

Objections, I hope (as ° Dr. Maurice says concerning *Clarkson*) that "For this I may be allowed to use the Plea of *Apuleius* on the like occasion, that I have taken Notice of many frivolous Things, lest to some I might seem to decline them as unanswerable, and not to omit them out of a just Contempt. And if my Answers to some mean and captious Remarks, may seem sometimes to taste of the Futility of the Objections; yet I hope this will be imputed to him, who was not ashamed to offer such things in Evidence, and not to me who was concerned to disprove them". As for our Author's apparent Blunders, Contradictions, and Inconsistencies which I have in the beginning of this Preface charg'd him with, I shall here make good that charge, by reciting a few of them, and shall leave it as a task upon him, and his learned Friends, with all the Logick they are Masters of, to reconcile them.

This is a matter so well attested by those that heard him, that (tho' at first, he deny'd it) he now allows it to be true, but then gives this Pretty turn to it, that "he and several Friends with him spoke to an Echo, and mentioned Marlborough, to try how much it would repeat." But, here too the Curious have detected our Author in a Falshood, and assure me there is no Echo there, as he pretends there is. But perhaps his Voice is so agreeable and engaging above that of others, that Echo will oblige him only with an Answer. If any be offended at my making mention of this Exploit, they must blame him for it that forced me to do it.

° Preface of Diocesan Episcopacy, p. 8.

b

The

The Title of his first Pamphlet is.

The Validity of the Baptisms of Dissenting Ministers.

In the Pamphlet he argues wholly for the Validity of Lay-Baptism. [But if he owns, as it should seem he does, that he and his Brethren are Lay-Men, then indeed his Title-Page, and Book are not contradictory].

P. 14. *Defence.* He says, "all that I undertook was to shew that many Writers of the Church were for the *Validity of Lay-Baptism.*"

"This is the only thing I promis'd to make appear."

P. 14. *Def.*
"The Church allows the Validity of Lay-Baptism."

P. 28. *Def.* Speaking of the *Hampton-Court Conference*, he says thus;

"Since which time it must be own'd, that the Church of *England* does require a lawful Minister to be the Administrator of Baptism, who is the only authoriz'd Person by this Rubrick to do it."

P. 107. *Def.*

P. 22. *Of the Validity, &c.*
"The Child of a Christian Parent is a Christian as soon as it is born."

"The Child of a Christian Parent before Baptism is not a compleat Christian, it's not initiated in the Christian Church, nor enroll'd amongst the Number of the Faithful."

P. 7. *Of his Judgment, &c.* he says thus;

P. 6. Of his small Treatise falsely call'd, *The Judgment of the Church of England that Presbyters may ordain*, he says thus;

"Nor does it appear by any of the Alterations made in the Offices of the Church, that she chang'd her Opinion, till about fifty Years ago."

"And that she continues in the same Mind to *this very Day*, I doubt not to make appear from the present Book of Orders, which is confirm'd by Parliament."

And by this time, it may be hoped I have sufficiently considered our Author's Performance, which his Friends boasted to be *unanswerable*; a Performance, which, as it happened, pleas'd all sides; the Dissenters that it was done so well, and the Churchmen that it was no better.

I only add, with regard to the following Discourse, that I doubt not, but upon the unprejudiced perusal of it, the present Sentiments of some Men will be altered.

The Catalogue of *Scottish* Bishops, I formerly gave from Archbishop *Spotwood's* History, is also hereby vindicated. But if any farther Satisfaction be necessary in a Case so clear as I think this is, I shall endeavour to give it by the Publication of some Authentick Papers, which demonstratively prove, that, during the Presbyterian Usurpation in *Scotland*, there was a true Succession of Bishops preserv'd, and Episcopal Ordinations performed: And particularly, that Bishop *Lindesay* who baptized King *Charles I.* was a true Bishop (and not merely *Nominal*, as some vainly fancy) when he baptized that Prince. But this Dis-

course being larger than I at first designed it, I must therefore become a Debtor to the publick, against a more convenient Opportunity.

In the mean while, I cannot but observe, that even the History of *Calderwood*, a rigid Presbyterian, is, (I speak it upon good Authority) falsify'd and corrupted, and become very different from the original, *now* in the Hands of a Noble Lord. Who they were that corrupted it, and for what end, is easy to guess; and I will venture to say that the Advocates of Presbytery, as well as those of Popery have reason enough to blush to see their Artifices detected. But to return.

By the following Account, the Reader may observe the gradual Encroachments which Presbytery made upon Episcopacy in *Scotland*, and how *insolently* the Presbyterians behaved themselves both towards the Church and State. Hence also, any Man of ordinary Reach and Capacity may discern the restless Spirit of that Party, and may easily Prophesie that they will always endeavour, by Stratagem or Force, the Ruin of the Church of *England*. And from what has been formerly done here, and lately to our Sister-Church of *Scotland*, we have too much Reason to believe, that this Church will, when 'tis in their Power, (which God and his Majesty prevent) meet with no better Usage. How many of the Clergy beyond the *Tweed*, for not renouncing "the Damnable Sin of Prelacy", "that insupportable grievance" (as the Zealots moderately express it) have been

been turned out of their Cures and beggar'd? And can *We* on this side the River expect any gentler Treatment? Is not Toleration, which is *here* claim'd as a Right by our Dissenters, condemn'd *there*? Is not the true Episcopal Church envy'd even that * Toleration which by the Favour of the Government she now enjoys? And can we reasonably suppose that the Presbyterians in *England* will, when in Power, be of a more charitable and indulgent Disposition? Have not many of us already, in this Country especially, sufficiently experienc'd the Moderation of Fanaticism? Are not the utmost Endeavours used to ruine us, and our Families?

But to dismiss so melancholy a Subject and conclude: As the Church of *England* is the best, and most primitive Church in the World, so let us, who are true Members of it, (however we may be by Party-names unhappily distinguish'd) labour its Preservation. Let us not, by the Impiety of our Lives, by our own unnatural Dissensions, and base Cowardice, provoke God to inflict the Punishment, which befell the once glorious *Asiatick* Churches. May our Church remain the Support and Honour of the Reformation! May it be so immoveably founded on a Rock,

* See Mr. Meldrum's Sermon, May 16, 1703, before the Duke of Queenberry, High-Commissioner, &c. against the Toleration of Episcopacy. See also several late Addresses from Scotland, wherein the Presbyterians plainly express their Dislike of Toleration, and would have the Government by their cunning Insinuations to take it away.

that all the Attacks of its Enemies, whether open or secret, of whatever Denomination, may never, never more be able to shake it! May neither Atheism nor Popery, Profaneness nor Schism; nor, in a Word, the Gates of Hell ever prevail against it!

O blessed Spirit! inspire all Orders and Degrees of Men amongst us with true Christian Courage, and a well-temper'd Zeal, to defend thy Church, amidst all those Dangers, which may at any time threaten her Destruction.

Derby. Lady-day, 1716.



CONTENTS

OF THE

PREFACE.

	Page
T HE Occasion of the Essay.	3
What it Undertakes to give account of.	5
Mr Shaw's Defence, a Rhapsody.	ib.
Brief Remarks upon the Treatment Mr. Shaw gives his Adversaries.	6
He gives up his Cause, and confesses that the Church allows no Lay Baptism.	9
Dr. Barlow, Dean of Chester, his Account of the Hampton-Court Conference vindicated.	10, 11
Mr. Shaw's Charge of Falshood refuted.	13
The Dissenting Teachers meer Laymen in the Judgment of those who have argued for, or against Lay-Baptism.	14
The Reasons some Clergymen gave at the Visitation at Derby, why Lay-Baptism is valid.	16
Mr. Shaw's Charge of Slander and Falshood, with regard to Mr. Baxter, &c. disprov'd.	18
His charge of Nonsense considered.	19
Excommunication by Lay-Chancellors.	22
Bp. Burnet's Preface.	23
Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism not uncharitable.	ib.
Lay-Baptism condemn'd by the Foreign Reform'd, and by the old Puritans.	24
Mr.	

CONTENTS to the PREFACE.

<i>Mr. Shaw detected in a palpable Falshood.</i>	25
<i>Justification of the Clergy who preach against Schism.</i>	29
<i>Mr. Shaw contradictory to himself.</i>	34
<i>Calderwood's History corrupted.</i>	36
<i>Insolence of Presbyterians in Scotland.</i>	ib.
<i>Presbyterians Enemies to Toleration.</i>	37
<i>The Conclusion.</i>	ib.



THE ROYAL MARTYR A *True Christian.*

IT has been made an Objection against the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-baptism, that it is attended with many dreadful Consequences. But that THAT way of arguing from Consequences is not at all *true* and *conclusive*, has been abundantly made appear by the Writers upon that Controversy: And I beg leave to say, that I hope I myself have prov'd such kind of reasoning to be false ^a. For by this Argument, Is it not *uncharitable* to assert the Truth of the Christian Religion, the Divinity of our blessed Saviour, the Necessity of Church-communion? According to this rate of reasoning, almost every Do-

^a See my Book, entitled, The Invalidity of the Lay-baptisms of Dissenting Teachers, p. 48.

ctrine must be branded for *uncharitable* and *false*, it being very certain that thousands are involv'd in the Consequences. Must not the Clergy assert and prove that Murder, Adultery, Swearing, Drunkenness, Heresy and Schism are Sins, because many thousands are involv'd in the Consequences, and (without Repentance) will be damn'd for them? Must we therefore erase these Sins out of our Bibles, and strike them out of the Catalogue of Vices? Must not a Clergyman preach Obedience to the Supreme Power, and is it an *uncharitable* and *false* Doctrine, because it reproaches the Villains of Forty eight, stigmatizes them with the infamous Character of Rebellion, nay, of Regicide, the very worst of Murders? And yet as unreasonable and absurd as this *Modern* way of arguing is, it is strange to consider what great and frequent Use has been made of it, and particularly in the late Dispute touching Lay-baptism. Among the many Assertors of that *singular* Conceit, that truly *popish* Notion, viz. that Lay-baptism is valid, there are two Right Reverend^b Bishops, who urge this Argument. And after those great Examples, Mr. Shaw^c a Dissenting Teacher in *Derby* closely copies. And because he cannot express himself in better Language than in *that* of their Lordships, he transcribes whole Paragraphs from their Writings, and gives a most *dismal* account of the sad Consequences, if it will not be allow'd that the Baptism of a Lay-Person is every whit as good and valid as *that* of an authoriz'd Minister of Jesus Christ. One Consequence which the Bishop of *Oxford* mentions in his Charge, and which the Dissenting Teacher fails not to take notice of, is this, That

^b Bp. of S—m, and Bp. of O—n. ^c Mr. Shaw in his *small Treatise, consisting chiefly of Collections from the Bp. of Sarum's Sermons, and Bp. of Oxford's Charge, Anno 1712.*

the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-baptism, not only unchristians some thousands of our own Church, but unchristians also King *James's* Children, and consequently the Blessed Martyr King *Charles I.* But that it may not be imagin'd that I wrong his Lordship by any false Inference, I will set down the very words as they stand in his Charge at the Visitation at *Oxford*.^d “How many thousands of our own Church must this Doctrine unchristian? If His [*i. e.* King *James's*] Opinion had been, that such as had been baptiz'd by Persons not episcopally ordain'd, were not baptiz'd, but sprinkled, and ought to have been baptiz'd again; He wou'd undoubtedly have order'd his own Children to have been re-baptiz'd here, who had been baptiz'd by Ministers who had only *Presbyterian* Orders in *Scotland*”. So that according to this worthy Bishop, concludes Mr. *Shaw*, “King *Charles I.* had no other Baptism, but such as is amongst us Dissenters; and according to the *Modern* High Church Notion, he was no Christian, although in the Service for the Thirtieth of *January* he is styl'd a Blessed Martyr^e”. To all which I have in a former Treatise return'd an Answer. And tho' the determination of the controverted Case of Lay-baptism depends not upon the Baptism of good King *Charles I.* whatever it was, yet, such is the respect I bear to the Memory of that excellent Prince, that it was a great concern to me to see any Suggestion, that He was not regularly admitted a Member of the Church of Christ. Wherefore I undertook to shew^f that it is highly probable from several Considerations, that King

^d See the Charge, p. 15. 4^{to}. 8th Edition.

^e Mr. Shaw's *Validity, &c.* p. 9.

^f P. 87. Invalidity of, &c.

Charles I. had the true episcopal Baptism. In the first place I observ'd that King James I. had a great averſion to *Presbytery*, and look'd upon it as a very arbitrary, tyrannical sort of Government, which wou'd raise it self above the Prerogative, and confront the Laws of the State: The Preachers frequently preach'd Treason and Rebellion from the Pulpits, and pleaded an Exemption from the Cognizance of the Civil Magistrate, when they were question'd for their Violation of the Laws. The King was shamefully revil'd to his very Face, particularly by Mr. *David Blake* in his Sermon at *St. Andrews*. He had such an Hatred to the Presbyterian Discipline, that he declar'd at the *Hampton-Court* Conference, that "Howsoever he lived among PURITANS, and was kept for the most part as a Ward under them, yet since he was of the Age of his Son, ten Years old, he ever disliked their Opinions; as the Saviour of the World, tho' he lived among them, he was not of them". So that considering his averſion to the Presbyterian Sect, I shew'd it was not probable that he wou'd be fond of having his Children sprinkled by the Supporters of it; and especially when he might have had either a Bishop or inferiour Minister rightly ordain'd from *England*, nay, in his own Kingdom, to administer the Sacrament of Baptism. But because it is by some asserted that Presbytery is the ancient Government in *Scotland*, and that Episcopacy is an Innovation, I therefore observ'd farther, that Episcopacy was the first Ecclesiastical Government; that the *Scots* had Bishops very early among them; that there was a constant Succession

g Gibſon call'd the King Jeroboam to his Face, and pronounc'd this Curse, that He should die childless, and be the last of his Race, &c. See Foulis's Hist. of the Presbyterian Plots, &c. p. 53. Oxford Edit. 1674.

of Bishops in every Century down to the Time of King James I. who was himself baptiz'd by the Archbishop of *St. Andrews*, at whose Baptism were present the Bishops of *Dunkeld*, *Dumblane*, and *Ross*. After the barbarous Murther of his Father by the Earl of *Bothwell*, he was crown'd and anointed King by the Bishop of *Orkney*. When his Children were born, I proceed to shew, that it is probable that there were true Ministers to be procur'd to perform the Office of Baptism; that Prince *Henry* was baptiz'd by the Bishop of *Aberdeen*, to whom he was presented by the Earl of *Sussex*, Ambassador from Queen *Elizabeth*; and that the rest of the King's Children, were (probably) baptiz'd by Mr. *David Lindsay*, Bishop of *Ross*, and Minister of *Leith*. And for the particular Proof of all this, I cite the Authorities of Archbishop *Spotswood* and Dr. *Lloyd*,^h now Lord Bishop of *Worcester*, whose Writings will afford a fuller Satisfaction. Thus from all these Considerations laid together, I infer the Probability of the true Baptism of King *Charles I.* These Arguments I thought sufficient to alledge in this regard, against an Assertion which wanted Proof, not thinking it necessary to labour a Point which could never determine the Controversy of Lay-baptism. For "Suppose (as I have argu'd) that the King's Children had not been baptiz'd at all, could the *Quakers* from thence draw a conclusive Argument against Water-baptism? Suppose they had not been baptiz'd till they arriv'd at Years of Discretion, would this have been a Justification of the Anabaptists Contempt of Infant-baptism? Or suppose that King, compell'd by Necessity, or out of Choice, did procure his Children to be sprinkled by a Presbyterian Teacher, would it follow from

h An Historical Account of Church-Government, &c.

"thence, that Presbyterian Ordination is valid, "and the Baptism valid perform'd by a pretended "Presbyter?" But since some noisy Objections have been made against my Reasons of PROBABILITY, which was all I contended for, I therefore think my self so far oblig'd in Justice to my self, and respect to the Blessed Martyr, to urge the Argument a little farther, and to prove, as I hope to do, beyond all Exception, that the King's Children might be episcopally baptiz'd, and particularly that King *Charles I.* was so, by a truly ordain'd Minister. And this I shall endeavour to do in the following Method:

I. By shewing that there were those in *Scotland* from time to time, who had receiv'd a true, Episcopal Ordination.

II. By proving positively that King *Charles I.* was baptiz'd by a rightly and episcopally ordain'd Administrator of Baptism.

I. I am to shew that there were those in *Scotland*, from time to time, who had receiv'd a true Episcopal Ordination. Now this I think will appear abundantly evident, not only from the Consideration of the constant Succession of Bishops, not *nominal* but *real*, and of a superiour Order to Presbyters, (which *Bede*, and from him the learned Bishop of *Worcester*, have fully prov'd) but also from hence, *viz.* because there were true Bishops both before and after the Reformation in *Scotland*. Before the Reformation, it is not to be doubted but there were Bishops, both as to the Name, and Thing, who presided in that Church, and whose Names may be seen in the Catalogue annex'd to

ⁱ See Invalidity, &c. p. 86.

the

the History of the Church of *Scotland*^k. King *James* the sixth of *Scotland*, and first of *England*, was born the 19th Day of *June*, Anno 1566, and was baptiz'd by the Bishop of *St. Andrews*, at whose Baptism there were present (as I said) the Bishops of *Dunkeld*, *Dumblane* and *Ross*. But to put the Matter beyond all dispute, it is acknowledg'd by some Presbyterian Advocates, that Prelacy was the Government of the *Scottish* Church at the Reformation. For *Cowpar*, Bishop of *Galloway*, having publish'd an Apology, Anno 1613, for taking upon him that Order; in a short time after, three Presbyterians made Objections to it in three Letters, to which the Bishop return'd his Answers: And it is observable by his Answers to two of them, that his Adversaries honestly confess'd that *that* Church was govern'd by Bishops *at*, and *before* the Reformation; and not only so, but that Episcopacy continued *after* the Reformation, even *ex confesso*, until the Year 1575. But that the Reader may judge for himself, I will set down the very Words as they may be found in *Cowpar's Dicaialogie*, p. 167. and quoted by the late reverend and learned Mr. *John Sage*^l. "You grant that from "the beginning of the Reformation, till the Year "1575, our Church contented themselves with "Bishops and Superintendents, why then is it "counted so odious that Bishops should be in it "now?" To the Author of the third Letter he writes thus. (See *ibid.* p. 174.) Bishops you grant "were once set up in our Church, with consent "of our Church: So your first Brother confess'd "before you; what aileth you then at a Bishop

^k See Spotswood's History, p. 196, 197.

^l Author of the Principles of the Cyprianick Age, and their Vindication, in his Remarks upon a Letter from a Gentleman in the City, to a Minister in the Countrey; and upon Mr. Williamson's Sermon, Printed 1703.

“ now? Why make you such a stir for receiving
 “ that which our best and oldest Fathers receiv’d
 “ before us? Why call you hereafter Episcopal
 “ Government THE ROMISH HIERARCHY?
 “ Did Mr. *Knox* and our Fathers set up ROMISH
 “ HIERARCHY?” This must follow if you
 be a true Man. “ Observe, (says Mr. *Sage*) *Cow-*
 “ *par* cites no such Concession from the second
 “ Letter, which is an Argument of his Integrity.
 “ Indeed how cou’d he have cited such Concessions
 “ from the other two, if they had not been in
 “ them?” We have then two clear Presbyterian
 Testimonies. To which we may add a *third*, viz.
 that of *Calderwood*, a rigid PRESBYTERIAN;
 who, tho’ he was exceeding partial to his Cause,
 yet cou’d not but confess this Point which carried
 along with it such a glaring Evidence.

Anno 1618. He wrote a Latin Epistle under the
 borrow’d Name of *Hieronymus Philadelphus*, in or-
 der to inform the Members of the Synod of *Dort*
 concerning the Differences in *Scotland* about Church
 Government. *Spotswood* publish’d a Refutation of
 it, Anno 1620. *Calderwood* writes a Vindication,
 Anno 1623. In which Vindication he more than
 once confesses, “ That the Form of the Govern-
 “ ment of the Church of *Scotland* was prelatical.”
 He allows that the Superintendents were vested
 with the Power of *ordaining* and *deposing* Parish
 Ministers, *auctorandi*, & *exauctorandi* Pastores.
 “ That, p. 21. they were *eminenter*, &c. eminent-
 “ ly cloath’d with Power above other Pastors.
 “ And again, p. 29. ’tis true, they cou’d ordain
 “ Pastors, and confirm them, *excommunicate* and
 “ *depose* unworthy Ministers, &c. And p. 103,
 “ and 107, he expressly says, that for the first fif-
 “ teen Years after the Reformation, Prelatical Go-
 “ vernment continu’d without opposition”. What
 more then needs to be said upon a Point which is
 fairly

fairly acknowledg’d even by the Adversaries of E-
 piscopacy? But now that the Ministers who then
 officiated in the Church of *Scotland*, and from the
 Reformation, whether of the Higher or Lower
 Orders, were *truly* and *episcopally* ordain’d, is not
surely to be doubted, when it is consider’d that
 there is the fairest Probability in the World to sup-
 pose, that there were several Popish Prelates and
 Priests who join’d in the blessed Work of Refor-
 mation, as well as some of the Laity did. Can we
 imagine that none but the Laity should have the
 Grace and good Fortune to see their Mistakes, and
 that the Clergy only should continue in their Er-
 rors? Is it probable that no Bishops, or other in-
 feriour Clergymen should concur in reforming the
 Corruptions and Abuses of Popery? Was it pecu-
 liar only to *England*, that a *Cranmer*, a *Latimer*, a
Farrar, or an *Hooper*, should be converted from
 Superstition and Idolatry? Why must the Clergy
 of *Scotland* be conceiv’d only to labour under Dark-
 ness and Delusion, when all the rest of Christendom
 were enlightned? Poor Gentlemen! cou’d they
 not distinguish between Truth and Error as well
 as illiterate Mechanics? Cou’d not they observe
 the gross Notions of Transubstantiation, Purgatory,
 Invocation of Saints, &c. as well as *they*, whose
 Education perhaps extended no farther than to the
 knowledge of their respective Trades and Sciences?
 If none of the Clergy were so happy as to join in
 the Measures of a Reformation, how shall we be able
 to account for the Success, and Progress of it? Who
 must preach the Word, and administer Sacraments,
 and offer up Prayers for the People? If then it be
 necessary to suppose, that there were of the Clergy of
 all Orders who reform’d from Popery in *Scotland*,
 as well as some did in *England*; then it will neces-
 sarily follow, nay, ’tis indeed allow’d, I think, on
 all hands, that their Episcopal Consecrations, and
 Ordi-

Ordinations, receiv'd from Bishops in the *Romish* Communion were valid; and if so, then *their* Acts, whether of Ordination, or Administration of Sacraments, as of Baptism, for instance, must also be valid, by virtue of the Commission they had receiv'd.

But now that *de facto* there were Clergymen who renounc'd the Errors of Popery, and concurr'd in the Work of Reformation, is plainly acknowledg'd by *Calderwood*, who mentions three Bishops particularly, *viz.* the Bishops of Galloway, Orkney, and *Cathness*; nay farther, he says, ^m "That Mr. *John Douglass* [afterwards] Bishop of St. Andrews, " was (before the Reformation) a *Carmelite* Frier, " and Chaplain to the Earl of *Argyle*". And this ⁿ Mr. *Shaw* himself quotes from *Calderwood* in his own Words. The excellent Treatise call'd, *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, written by Mr. *Sage*, proves incontestably that there were *Prelates*, who concurr'd in the Work of Reformation, as well as *Presbyters*. ^o *Knox* says there were present in the Parliament holden in *August* 1560, (which Parliament gave the first National Establishment to our *Scottish* Reformation) *The Bishop of Galloway, the Abbots of Lundoris, Culrofs, St. Colmes-inch, Coldingham, St. Mary-Isle, and the Subprior of St. Andrews, with divers others.* And of all these, he says, *That they had renounc'd Papistry, and openly profess'd Jesus Christ.*

^p *Spotswood* reckons up no fewer than eight of the *Spiritual Estate*, all Protestants, chosen at that Time, to be *Lords of the Articles*: Namely, *The Bishops of Galloway and Argyle, the Prior of St. Andrews, the Abbots of Aberbrothoick, Kilwinning, Lundors, Newbottle and Culrofs.* Lay these two

^m P. 56. *Hist.*
^o Kn. 260.

ⁿ P. 38, 39. Defence of his Validity.
^p *Spotf.* 149.

Accounts together, and you shall have at least a round Dozen of Reforming Prelates. To these I add, ^q *Thomas Guillam* a Frier, who, as *Petrie* says, was the first publick Preacher of the Reform'd Religion in *Scotland*, by whose Sermons *John Knox* got the first lively Impressions of the Truth. After the Pacification of *Leith*, which was concluded in *July* 1560, Ministers were distributed among the several Towns. ^r *John Knox* was appointed for *Edinburgh*, *Christopher Goodman* for *St. Andrews*, *Adam Herriot* for *Aberdeen*, *John Row* for *Perth*, *William Chrystison* for *Dundee*, *David Ferguson* for *Dumfermline*, *Paul Metbuen* for *Jedburgh*, and *Mr. David Lindesay* for *Leith*. Beside these, five were nominated to be *Superintendents*; *Spotswood* for *Lothian* and *Mers*, *Winram* for *Fife*, the Laird of *Dun* for *Angus* and *Merns*, *Willock* for *Glasgow*, and *Carswell* for *Argyle* and the *Isles*; these are all who are reckon'd up by ^s *Knox* and *Spotswood*. And *Spotswood* adds, "With this small number " was the Plantation of the Church at first under- " taken ^t".

That the Order of Bishops, as superiour to Presbyters, was actually in being at, and did continue for some time after the Reformation, and that Ordination to the Ministry was in like manner Episcopal, is manifest from this very Consideration, namely, that from the very first Dawnings of the Reformation, till some Years after it was publickly establish'd, which was, as I have said, *Anno* 1560. we do not read that the Protestants, either in Disputes with Papists, or with one another, did ever insist upon the Divine Right of Parity or Equality among the Ministers of Christ's Church.

^q See p. 4. *Fundamental Charter*, Printed at London, for C. Brome, 1695. And p. 73. *Pet.* 180, and *Life of Knox*.

^r *Spotf.* 149,

^s Kn. 159. *Spot.* 149.

^t *Fundamental Charter*, p. 6.

Nay, the learned Mr. *Sage* ^v challenges his Presbyterian Brethren to produce any one Protestant Confession of Faith for their side of the Question, or to instance in any one Protestant Divine, of Note, who in these Times maintain'd their Side of the Controversy; *i. e.* who maintain'd the *Unlawfulness* of *Imparity* amongst Christian Pastors, before *Theodore Beza* did it, if he did it? And he shews afterwards that he did not, as some wou'd have it; nor did he allow of Separation upon the account of it. But as for Mr. *Calvin*, "The *Presbyterians* cannot, says he, without the greatest Impudence, pretend that he was of their Principles". That he did not maintain the *Unlawfulness* of Prelacy, as the *Scotish* Presbyterians and others have done, will appear from his Commentaries, particularly on 1 Cor. xi. 2. and from some Chapters in the beginning of his fourth Book of *Institutions*, from his Book of the *Necessity of Reforming the Church*, from his Epistles to the *Protector of England*, Oct. 22. 1548. to *Cranmer*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and to the Bishop of *London*, to *Ithavius*, Bishop of *Uladislavia*, and to the King of *Poland*, &c.

So that upon the whole matter, 'tis very plain that the Pastors of the Church of *Scotland*, both before the Reformation, and for some time after it, were duly ordain'd by those whom we call Bishops, there being then no such thing as Presbyterian Ordination in practice even in *Scotland* it self, as I shall make more fully appear in the Sequel of this Discourse.

The Reformation was first attempted, Anno 1558, ^w about ten Years after the Reformation in *England*. And Anno 1560, the Reformation was establish'd, ^x as has been said before. And it is observable that

^v P. 11. Fundamental Charter.

^w Spotswood, p. 97, 117.

^x Spotswood, p. 150.

Prelacy continu'd uninterrupted in the Church, at least for 15 Years after the National Establishment, as *Calderwood* himself acknowledges. [See p. 8. of this Discourse.] And Archbishop *Spotswood* expressly mentions the Names of the Bishops of the Sees, not of those only who met in the Parliament in 1560, ^y but of those also who presided in the Episcopal Sees, after the Church became Protestant, and perform'd Divine Offices and Acts of the Ministry. And whereas that Right Reverend Author sometimes mentions Superintendents also, 'tis plain that tho' the Name was different from that of Bishop, yet the Power was the same, as is notoriously conspicuous from his own Words. "The Superintendents, says he, held their Office *during Life*, and their Power was Episcopal; for they did elect, and ordain Ministers, they presided in Synods, and directed all Church Censures, neither was any Excommunication pronounced without their Warrant." And by the Articles agreed unto by the Council and Church at *Leith*, "1. It was ordered that the Archbishopricks and Bishopricks presently void, should be disposed to the most qualified of the Ministry. 2. That the Spiritual Jurisdiction should be exercised by the Bishops in their Diocese. 6. That the Ministers should receive Ordination from the Bishop, and where no Bishop was yet placed, from the Superintendent of the Bounds.---According to these Conclusions Mr. *John Douglas* was provided to the Bishoprick of *St. Andrews*, Mr. *James Boyd* to the Archbishoprick of *Glasgow*, Mr. *James Patton* to the Bishoprick of *Dunkeld*, and Mr. *Andrew Gbrame* to the Bishoprick of *Dumblane*" ^z. But in the Year 1575, which is fifteen Years af-

^y Spotswood, 149. See the Catalogue also.

^z Spots. 258, 260.

ter the aforefaid Establishment, the Presbyterian Spirit began to shew itself. "In the Church this Year," says Archbishop *Spotswood*, began the "Innovations to break forth, that to this Day have kept it in a continual Unquietness. Mr. *Andrew Melvil*, who was lately come from *Geneva*, &c. a Man learned (chiefly in the Tongues) but hot, and eager upon any thing he went about, labouring with a burning Desire to bring into this Church the Presbyterian Discipline of *Geneva*; and having insinuated himself into the favour of divers Preachers, he stirr'd up *John Drury* one of the Ministers of *Edinburgh*, in an Assembly which was then conven'd, to propound a Question touching the Lawfulness of the Episcopal Function, and the Authority of Chapters in their Election. He himself, as tho' he had not been acquainted with the Motion, after he had commended the Speaker's Zeal, and seconded the Purpose with a very long Discourse of the flourishing Estate of the Church of *Geneva*, and the Opinions of *Calvin* and *Theodore Beza* concerning Church-Government, came to affirm that none ought to be Office-bearers in the Church, whose Titles were not found in the Book of God: And for the Title of Bishops, albeit the same was found in Scripture, yet it was not to be taken in that Sense that the common sort did conceive, there being (as he confidently and falsely said) no Superiority allow'd by Christ amongst Ministers, he being the only Lord of his Church, and all the same Servants in the same Degree, and having the like Power. In the end he said, that the Corruptions crept into the Estate of Bishops were so great, as unless the same were remov'd, it could not go well

^a Spotsfw. 275.

"with the Church, nor could Religion be long preserv'd in Purity". Thus far Archbishop *Spotswood*! From which Passage, 'tis I think, exceeding plain, that Episcopacy was the Ecclesiastical Government at that time in the Church of *Scotland*; for else why should Presbyterian Parity be so much contended for, and recommended? Why must the Presbyterian Discipline of *Geneva* be at all spoken of, and applauded by *Melvil*, "A Man hot, and eager upon any thing he went about", if it had been there before? Why did he affirm (tho' falsely, as has been by many made appear) that "No Superiority was allow'd by Christ amongst Ministers", if there were then an Equality, or a Presbyterian Government? And lastly, Why does Archbishop *Spotswood* call the Design of the Presbyterian Government, and Exclusion of Episcopal Authority, an *Innovation*, but because Episcopacy had always been, and was then, the establish'd Government in that Church?

But to go on with the Innovation, as Archbishop *Spotswood* justly terms it. Since this Discourse of *Melvil*'s was applauded by many, "Some Brethren (says my Historian) were set apart to reason and confer upon the Question proponed. For the one part, Mr. *David Lindesay*, Mr. *George Hay*, and Mr. *John Row*, these three sustained the Lawfulness of Episcopal Function in the Church. For the other part, Mr. *James Lawson*, Mr. *John Craig*, and Mr. *Andrew Melvil*, [the hot, and eager INNOVATOR] were chused to impugn the same". ^b And as it follows, p. 276. of *Spotswood*'s History; there were present in the Assembly several Bishops and Superintendents, as for instance, "The Archbishop of *Glasgow*, and the Bishops of *Dunkeld*, *Galloway*, *Briehen*, *Dumblane* and

^b Spotsfw. 275.

“ *Isles*, with the Superintendents of *Lothian* and “ *Angus*, all of ’em interest’d in that Business”, as it concern’d their Episcopats, and was a Design to dispossess them of their Sees. And since the Presbyterian Party had got a Majority of Voices, it was order’d in the next Assembly, “ That the “ Bishops should take themselves to the Service “ of some one Church within their Diocese, and “ condescend upon the particular Flocks, whereof “ they would accept the Charge”. This Design thus agreed to by a Presbyterian Party in the Assembly, was dislik’d by the Regent, and he took very ill the Deposition of Mr. *James Patton*, Bishop of *Dunkeld*, and notwithstanding these violent and innovating Proceedings, upon the Death of Mr. *John Douglas*, he recommended his Chaplain Mr. *Patrick Adamson*, to the Chapter of *St. Andrews*, to fill that See, who was chosen, notwithstanding he had before refused “ *To submit himself “ to the Trial, and receive the Office with those In- “ junctions the Church* [or rather the Presbyterian “ Party in it, which assum’d that Title] *would pre- “ scribe*”. However sanguine the Hopes of the Presbyterian Rebels against their spiritual Princes or Bishops were, they were frustrated at that Time, and the Conference which the Regent indulg’d ’em upon the Subject, broke off (says my Historian) by occasion of the Troubles that arose, p. 277. So that the total Extirpation of Episcopacy, or according to the Modern Phrase, the Root and Branch Work, could not then be effected. From all which I make this Observation, which I doubt not will be obvious to every Reader, viz. That the Government of the Church was Episcopal. But as the Presbyterian Spirit never flags, but is ever restless and projecting, so it continued to cherish it self with hopes of Victory, which (God knows) IT in time obtain’d. In the Year 1580, in an Assembly

bly conven’d at *Dundee*: It was not only concluded by the *Corahites* of that Time, that Episcopacy was unwarrantable and unlawful, and not ground’d upon the Word of God; but it was moreover declar’d, that the Bishops should forsake their Office, and cease from preaching, ministring the Sacraments, or using in any sort the Office of a Pastor, till they should be admitted of new of the General Assembly, under the Pain of Excommunication^c.

So that by this Conclusion, the Presbyterians pretended to delete the Episcopal Character, and to degrade and reduce the Bishops to the Form of Laymen. “ And whether (as Archbishop *Spots- “ wood* very well remarks) the *Folly or Iniquity* “ of this Ordinance was greater, it can hardly be “ said; for granting that the Office of a Bishop “ had been as they judg’d, unlawful, there was

^c See *Spotswood* 311, who tells us the Assembly concluded thus. “ That the Office of a Bishop, as it was then us’d, and commonly taken within the Realm, had neither Foundation, “ Ground, nor Warrant in the Word of God. Thereupon an “ Ordinance was made that all Persons, either call’d to the “ same Office, or that should be call’d thereto at any time “ thereafter, should be charg’d to demit and forsake the same, “ as an Office whereunto they are not call’d of God; as also “ to desist and cease from preaching, ministring the Sacraments, “ or using in any sort the Office of a Pastor, till they should “ be admitted of new of the general Assembly, under the Pain “ of Excommunication”. In the end of the Act it was directed, “ That concerning the Patrimony of the Church pos- “ sessed by the Bishops, the next Assembly should reason and “ advise upon the disposing thereof”. *Calderwood*, p. 90. of his History speaks to the same purpose, and often in the very same Words. He adds, that the Bishops of *St. Andrews*, *Aberdeen* and *Glasgow* were order’d to compare, every one where their Sees were, but the Bishop of *Murray* at *Elgine*, to give Obedience to the Act of the Assembly, or else be excommunicated. He says the Bishop of *Dumblane* submitted. In this fourth Session they damn’d the Office of a Bishop, as it was then used, and commonly taken within this Realm, and meant not to allow any sort of Bishop, Anglicane or Romane.

“no reason to discharge them of using the ministerial Office till they should be received of new”. Great Endeavours were used to persuade the King and his Council to approve of their *Innovations* and Decrees, which when they could not prevail with him to do, the Ministers utter’d from the Pulpits scurrilous *Invectives* against the King, and their Expressions were most impudent and seditious.^d They suggested to the People that the Government design’d to bring in *Popery*, and to extirpate the *Protestant* Religion. An Artifice which the Presbyterian Party never fail to make use of, to calumniate their Betters, and pave a Way for that Confusion and Ruin of our Constitution, which they will effect, whenever they have an Opportunity. This is an Engine with which they have already done a lamentable deal of Mischief, and may do more, if we be not so prudent as to prevent it. However, this Noise of Popery being likely to make an ill Impression upon the Minds of the Vulgar, who are generally carried away by *Noise* and *Nonsense*, it was therefore thought highly expedient that the World should receive all possible Satisfaction, that there was no such wicked Design as that of *Popery* intended. Accordingly His Majesty commands John Craig^e his Minister, to compile a negative Confession in the Form of an Oath, wherein they expressly, and without *Equivocation*, call God to witness, that they *abjur’d* particularly all the Corruptions of *Rome*, as well in Doctrine as outward Rites. “So careful was the King (says *Spotswood*) to have the Church satisfy’d, and “Rumours of the Court’s Defection from Religion suppressed”. So that when this Oath was taken by the King, &c. in Jan. 1581. the second

^d Spotsw. 330, 334. Mr. Sage’s Remarks, p. 25.

^e Spotsw. 309.

Book of Discipline was not ratify’d, (for that was not ratify’d till the Assembly met in April, 1581.) and consequently they could not swear to the Discipline of the second Book, which was not yet ratify’d. It therefore necessarily follows, that when they swore to “Continue in the Doctrine and Discipline of this Kirk”, they swore to the Government and Discipline Episcopal, because at that time Episcopacy stood established by Law, and was very different from the *Romish* Hierarchy: In a word, who that suffers his Reason to sit above his Prejudices, can ever think that the King would himself abjure, and require others to do the like, a Government which was supported by his Laws?

But notwithstanding all the Care taken by the King, to suppress all Jealousies of a Relapse into Superstition and Idolatry, notwithstanding his earnest Endeavours to confirm and settle the Reformed Episcopal Church, and preserve it from Presbyterian Innovation, the Presbyterian Leaven still fermented in the Hearts of the *Melvilians*, and as appears from the Instances mentioned in the Margin^f, these Novelists gave no small Disturbance to the Government. Rumours were again industriously dispers’d that the King was declined to Popery, had made several Acts to hinder the free Passage of the Gospel, and abolish all Order and Policy in the Church. What those Acts were, which were so highly offensive to the squeamish

^f See Mr. Walter Balcanquel’s reproachful Speeches in a Sermon, and his Answer when questioned: Spotswood 317. Mr. Robert Pont’s Protestation: Mr. Andrew Melvil’s Answer, and the Proceeding of a rebellious Assembly against Bishop Montgomery, when the King had commanded them to desist, p. 318, 319, &c. And Complaint of Grievances, p. 327. Melvil forc’d to fly into England, p. 330. Several Presbyterian Ministers fled, who were charg’d as Rebels and Accomplices in the Gowry-Conspiracy, p. 333. The King charg’d with Popery, *ibid*. Pamphlets were written against the Court, p. 334.

Stomachs of these Reforming *Aerians*, is easy to be observ'd from the best and most authentick History. For the Preachers of the Presbyterian Faction having scandalously abus'd the King's Person, and vilify'd his Authority, and in short done every thing that could by any means shake his Government, and alienate his People's Affections from him; it was found absolutely necessary to check the Fanatick Fury of these Pretenders to Reformation. And accordingly several Acts or Statutes were made in this Year 1584, in favour of the ancient Church-Government; the 8 Presbyterian Mock-Government was pull'd down, several seditious Preachers and Trumpeters of Rebellion were silenc'd; some were imprison'd, and others (to save their Heads out of the Halter, which by their Rebellion they had very well deserv'd) were forc'd to leave *Scotland*: Their General and Special Assemblies of the Presbyteries were prohibited; Books, Pamphlets and Poems stuff'd with Treason, were burnt, and Episcopal Authority was restor'd. Hereupon Mr. *Robert Pont* protesteth against those Acts, alledging that They, the Ministers of the Presbyterian Kirk, were not oblig'd to give their Obedience to these Acts; and then *fleeing*, was denounced a Rebel. This Protestation, and several scandalous Rumours of Popery, gave occasion to a Declaration, in which, among other Reasons there mentioned, this is one the King gives why those Acts were made, *viz.* "Because a Number of Ministers "and Gentlemen had usurped the Ecclesiastical "Jurisdiction". And now that the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, which was so usurped, was truly Episcopal, I think is abundantly evident, not only from the whole History of those Times, but even from the Letter ^h which the Ministers of the Ge-

^g Camb. Eliz. p. 361, 1584. Spotsw. 333.

^h See the Letter, Spotsw. 334.

neva-Model sent, after they had left their People. In *that*, they particularly complain of these Acts, "As repugnant to the Word of God, and Doctrines "by them preached; they call the Bishops, *Gross "Libertines, Belly Gods and Infamous*, and the "Regiment of Bishops, *Tyrannical*"; and are not a little angry with the Articles which were presented to some Ministers for submitting themselves to the *Tyrannical Regiment* of Bishops; nay, they acknowledge that a Charge was given to the Provost and Bayliffs of *Edinburgh*, to take and apprehend those that should "Convene to the Eldership, and those that should in Sermon utter any "thing against the Act"; *i. e.* in a word, *Those* that should refuse to submit to Episcopal Authority, or should asperse *it*, and those Acts which enforced Submission to *it*. They declare that they "Could "not go from their good Course", as they falsely call'd Presbyterian Government; from all which 'tis plain that Prelacy was again established and settled by those Acts. But this appears yet plainer from that Subscription which the Ministers were daily all that Summer, 1584, called to make before the Council, "To certain Articles which "concerned their Obedience to the Bishops": And here 'tis observable, that those "Who refused, "had their Stipends ⁱ sequestrated". But that the Ministers might have no reason to complain of Force, the King order'd the Principal of them to propose their Reasons of Refusal in writing, that he might consider the same, and satisfy their Doubts; for as he himself said, "All his Desire was to have "the Church peaceably governed, and a decent Policy "established". But if there be occasion for farther Evidence in so clear a Case as this is, I would observe that when the Act was past on the last of

ⁱ Spotsw. 336.

July, 1585, which allows King James VI. to make a League with Queen Elizabeth, for the Defence of the Protestant Religion against the Confederacies of the Papists; there were in that Convention of the Estates, ^k the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and Glasgow, and the Bishop of Dunkeld; &c. of the Spiritual Estate. That Episcopacy was the Ecclesiastical Government of the Church in Scotland is manifest beyond Dispute, from the Words of Mr. John Spotswood ^l, who was Superintendent of Lothian, and died December 5, 1585, in the 76th Year of his Age. Now when in his last Days, he saw the Ministers take such Liberty as they did, and heard of the Disorders raised in the Church through that CONFUSED PARITY which Men laboured to introduce, as likewise the Irritations the King received by a sort of foolish Preachers, *i. e.* those of the Presbyterian Stamp and Principle: “ He lamented extreamly the Case of the Church to those who came to visit him (who were not a few, and of the better sort) he continually foretold that the Ministers by their Follies would bring Religion in hazard, and as he fear’d, provoke the King to forsake the Truth; therefore wished some to be placed in Authority over them to keep them in awe; for the Doctrine, said he, we profess, is good, but the old Policy [*i. e.* Episcopal Government] is undoubtedly the better: God is my Witness, I lie not”. What this wise Man justly feared, did afterwards in part come to pass; for Mr. Andrew Melvil before spoken of, the Beginner of these Disturbances in the Church, was pleased to call a Number of Barons, Gentlemen and Ministers together in April, 1586, and this Rout he thought fit to style a Synod; the Design of which *principally* was to be revenged

^k Spotsfw. 340.

^l Spotsfw. 344.

of the Bishop of St. Andrews, who was supposed to have devised those Acts made in the Parliament, 1584, and to have *penn’d* the Declaration; both which were so much in Favour of Episcopacy, and destructive of the Presbyterian Model, as has been before mentioned. ’Tis true, the Bishop appeared according to his Citation, but *protested* against the Judicatory. He affirm’d that the Bishops *represented in part the Estate* of the Church, which was ever reputed the *first Estate* of the Realm since the Kingdom became Christian; and as to that they were pleased to say, with regard to Episcopal Jurisdiction, that it was by those Acts *ratified* as in Time of *Popery*, he added (^m “ That for the Episcopal Power there was enough to be said, if the Time were fitting”. But if they had nothing farther to say, he would leave them; and so appealing to his Majesty, the Council, and the three Estates of the Realm (of which Estates the Bishops by the way were one) or to any other lawful Assembly (for that was really none) convened by his Majesty, he departed. And tho’ this pretended Synod was inclinable enough to censure the Bishop, yet none of them durst presume to exercise that Power, except one ⁿ Andrew Hunter, a mere Layman, and Servant to Melvil, who desir’d ’em to stay, telling ’em that he was moved by the Spirit to excommunicate the Bishop; and accordingly in the Presence of a few Witnesses he read the Sentence of Excommunication. After this, the Presbyterian Party grew very fierce and violent, and were resolved to censure those Ministers, who had by their Subscriptions allowed the Acts made in Parliament, 1584. But the Number of the Subscribers or Friends of Episcopacy was so *great*, that the wiser sort did not think it prudent, for fear of a Schism, to urge

^m Spotsfw. 345.

ⁿ Spotsfw. 346.

that Matter strictly. However they were pleased to condemn and disapprove what some Ministers had done with respect to their admitting of Bishops, and allowing them to have the chief Rule in Ecclesiastical Affairs; and after a long Dispute, concluded with this false Position, ° *That a Bishop was a Pastor as other ordinary Pastors are, &c.* and ordered, That his Life and Doctrine should be tried by a Presbytery or Synod, which *Conclusion* was protested against by the King's Commissioners; and it was by them declared, that since "The Assembly had gone from the Articles, nothing either then or at the present concluded, should stand in force". And farther, it is observable, that the King himself was very highly displeased at these Usurpations of the Novelists; and when the Secretary, who then supply'd the Place of *Chancellor*, told him that the Ministers were so refractory and unwilling to be ruled, that therefore he thought it more adviseable to let 'em alone to ruin themselves by their own Madnes^p, adding, "That in a short time they would become so intolerable, that the People would chase 'em out of the Countrey": The King reply'd, "True, if I were purposed to undo the Church and Religion, I should think *your Counsel not ill*, but my Mind is to maintain both; therefore can I not suffer 'em to run into these Disorders that will make Religion to be despised".

After this, we hear little of these Murmurers against the Hierarchy, till that unfortunate Business happen'd of *Mary Queen of Scots*, who being under the Sentence of Condemnation, the King her Son commanded all Ministers to remember Her in their Prayers, after this *most Christian and Lawful Form*, viz. ¶ "That it might please God to illu-

° Spotsw. 347.

p Spotsw. 348.

¶ Spotsw. p. 354.

" minate

" minate Her with the Light of his Truth, and save her from the apparent Danger wherein she was cast". This Petition, however reasonable, charitable and pious, the Ministers refus'd to put up for her, except Mr. *David Lindesay* at *Leith*, and the King's own Chaplains. Whereupon the King appointed a Day, viz. Feb. 3. 1586. for solemn Prayers for his Mother at *Edinburgh*, where (such was the unparallel'd Impudence of the Presbyterian Faction) a raw young Novice, Mr. *John Cowpar*, was excited by the Ministers, though he was not *in Function*, to take Possession of the Pulpit before the Bishop of *St. Andrews* came, who was appointed to officiate on that solemn Occasion. This I mention, to shew only that Episcopacy was then in being, notwithstanding the great Efforts of the Sticklers for a Parity to extirpate it. Anno 1586, by many sham Pretences, an Act of Parliament was obtain'd to alienate the "Temporality of Benefices", and annex it to the Crown, and to dispose the Presbyterian Faction to farther this *gracious Design*, (which indeed was unnecessary, considering their natural Inclination to Mischief) it was whisper'd to such of the Ministry as sought the Subversion of Episcopacy; *That this was the only way to undo the Prelacy, for there being no Livings to maintain them* [i. e. Bishops] none would be found to accept those Places; which, says my Historian, prov'd also true. And the King himself was so very sensible of the Mischief which Episcopacy sustain'd by this very Act, that he repented it so long as he liv'd: And although by reason of the Prevalency of the Faction, and the sad Circumstances he was under, as the History of those Times informs us, he was even forc'd, contrary to his natural Inclination, to give his Assent to that Act, and to continue it, whilst his Affairs were so perplex'd and intricate; yet he repented it. "He did

“ did fore forethink (says *Spotswood*) the passing
 “ of that Act, calling it a *vile Act*”. And had it
 pleas’d the Divine Providence, that he had extri-
 cated himself out of those Troubles wherein he
 was embarrass’d, ’tis plain from his own Words in
 his Book he wrote, particularly for the Use of his
 Son, (*viz.* Δῶρον Βασιλικόν) that he wou’d, if pos-
 sible, have got a Repeal of that *vile Act*. How-
 ever, if he could not do it, he recommended it to
 his Son to annul it. But that I may at once give
 a full Satisfaction to my Reader, and prevent the
 wretched Cavils of the Enemies of Episcopacy, I
 will here faithfully set down the very Words of that
 Royal Writer, from which a farther Testimony
 will be collected, that Episcopacy was the ancient
 Government in *Scotland*, and that Presbyterian Pa-
 rity was an *Innovation*, and *Usurpation* upon it, and
 was begun and carry’d on by some Factious Schisma-
 tical Ministers, and hot-headed Zealots in the *Scot-
 tish* Church.

“ Some fiery spirited Men in the Ministry, got
 “ such a guiding of the People at that time of Con-
 fusion, as finding the Gust of Government sweet,
 “ they bequoth⁹ to fancy to themselves a demo-
 cratick Form of Government— And so in a po-
 pular Government, by leading the People by the
 “ Nose, to bear the Sway of all the Rule—And be-
 cause the[†] learned, grave and honest Men of the
 “ Ministry, were ever ashamed with their Teme-
 rity and Presumption, pressing by all good Means
 “ by their Authority and Example, to reduce them
 “ to a greater Moderation; there could be no
 “ way found out so meet in their Conceit, that
 “ were turbulent Spirits among them, for main-

⁹ Begun.

[†] *Calderwood in his History printed 1678,*
 p. 428. acknowledges these Passages: “ Wherein (*says he*) the
 “ King’s Mind in Matters of the Kirk, was clearly discover’d”.

“ taining

“ taining their Plots, as PARITY in the Church;
 “ whereby the Ignorants were embolden’d, as
 “ Bairds, to cry the learned, godly, and modest
 “ out of it: PARITY the MOTHER of *Confusion*,
 “ and ENEMY to UNITY, which is the MOTHER
 “ of Order: For if by the Example thereof once
 “ established in the ecclesiastical Government, the
 “ politick and civil Estate should be drawn to the
 “ like, the great Confusion that thereupon wou’d
 “ arise, may easily be discerned.

“ Take heed (my Son) to such *Puritans*, very
 “ Pests in the Church and Commonweale; whom
 “ no Deserts can oblige, neither Oaths or Promi-
 “ ses bind, breathing nothing but Sedition and Ca-
 “ lumnies; aspiring without Measure, railing with-
 “ out Reason, and making their own Imaginati-
 “ ons (without any Warrant of the Word) the
 “ Square of their Conscience. I protest before
 “ the great God, and since I am here as upon my
 “ Testament, it is no Place for me to lie in, that
 “ ye shall never find with any Highland or Bor-
 “ der-Thieves, greater Ingratitude, and more Lies
 “ and vile Perjuries, than with these fanatick Spi-
 “ rits: And suffer not the Principals of them to
 “ brook your Land, if ye like to sit at rest; ex-
 “ cept ye would keep them for trying your Pati-
 “ ence, as *Socrates* did an evil Wife. And for the
 “ Preservative against their Poison, entertain and
 “ advance the godly, learned, and modest Men of
 “ the Ministry, whom of (God be praised) there
 “ lacketh not a SUFFICIENT Number; and by
 “ their Provision to Bishopricks and Benefices
 “ (annulling that vile Act of Annexation, if ye find
 “ it not done to your Hand) ye shall not only ba-
 “ nish their CONCEITED PARITY, whereof I have
 “ spoken, and their other imaginary Grounds;
 “ which can neither stand with the Order of the
 “ Church, nor the Peace of a Commonweale, and
 “ ruled

“ ruled ‘ Monarchy ; but ye shall also re-establiſh
 “ the old Inſtitution of three Eſtates in Parlia-
 “ ment, which can no otherwiſe be done. But
 “ in this I hope (if God ſpare me Days) to make
 “ you a fair Entry: Always where I leave, follow
 “ ye my Steps. And to end my Advice anent
 “ the Church-Eſtate, Cherish no Man more than
 “ a good Paſtor, hate no Man more than a proud
 “ Puritan, &c. As well as ye repreſs the vain Pu-
 “ ritan, ſo not to ſuffer proud papal Biſhops ”.

So that from theſe Words only it is very evi-
 dent, that Presbyterian Parity was an Upſtart In-
 novation, and directly contrary to the eſtabliſhed
 Government of the Church.

But to return to my Hiſtory of the Encroach-
 ments of Presbytery. After the aforeſaid fatal
 Act, the Presbyterian Party gain’d Ground apace,
 and grew every Day more and more arbitrary
 and tyrannical in the Aſſemblies. In the Year
 1589, they cenſur’d and depriv’d the v Biſhop of
 St. Andrews; and to render him “ the more hate-
 ful and contemptible”, they order’d the Sentence
 to be “ publiſh’d in all the Churches of the King-
 dom”; and for no other Fault, but becauſe he had,
 at the Command of the King himſelf, celebrated
 the Marriage of the King’s Couſin, the Duke of
 Lenox his Siſter, to the Earl of Huntley. And when
 in the Year 1590, the Coronation of King James’s
 Queen was to be ſolemniz’d, the Ceremony of
 Unction was ſtrenuouſly oppos’d and decry’d by
 ſeveral of the Presbyterian Miniſters, and particu-
 larly by * Mr. John Daviſon an “ idle, turbulent
 “ Man, who had gain’d ſome Credit with certain
 “ fooliſh People, that would be thought more holy
 “ and zealous than other”. And in this ridiculous
 Oppoſition he was ſupported and encouraged by

[†] A good Caveat to all Princes. [†] See Βασίλειον Δῶρον,
 p. 160, 161, London Edition. v Spotf. 377. * Spotf. 381.

the hot and eager Mr. Melvil beforementioned.
 But when the King grew ſtiff and reſolute, and
 peremptorily inſiſted upon it, telling ’em that if
 they wou’d not uſe the Ceremony of Unction, he
 wou’d v prorogue the Coronation, and ſtay till one
 of the Biſhops came, who wou’d not reſuſe: Then
 it was allow’d by the tender conſcienc’d Mr. Mel-
 vil and his Brethren, that the Ceremony ſhould be
 us’d, rather than a Biſhop ſhould be employ’d on
 that Occaſion. *Riſum teneatis?*

Now they concluded themſelves to have got ſo
 ſure a footing, that in this Year they order’d Mr.
 Patrick Galloway to preſent in their Name, a Peti-
 tion to the King, that their “ Jurisdiction might
 be eſtabliſhed”, and all Acts made contrary to
 Presbytery, might be “ abolithed”. Anno 1592,
 the Presbyterian Party oblig’d Mr. Patrick Adam-
 ſon, to ſubſcribe certain Articles, “ allowing the
 “ Presbyterian Diſcipline, and condemning the Go-
 “ vernment Epifcopal”; which Articles ſo ſub-
 ſcrib’d, were afterwards printed and publiſh’d in
 his Name, under the Title of Mr. Patrick Adam-
 ſon’s Recantation. But that I may not tranſmit this
 Biſhop to Poſterity under ſo foul an Imputation, I
 will here obſerve (what indeed in Juſtice might be
 expected from me) that there are ſeveral Cir-
 cumſtances, which if they do not wholly clear
 him from Guilt, do however very much extenuate
 his Crime. Archbiſhop Spotſwood tells us, p. 385.
 that the Presbyterians, hearing that he was very ill
 and bedrid, and under great Neceſſity, ſent ſome of
 their Brethren after an inſidious manner, to get his
 Hand in Teſtimony to their new Diſcipline. He
 told them, he did not trouble himſelf with ſuch
 Thoughts at that time, and had never allow’d of
 any other Biſhop in the Church, but St. Paul’s

Bishop, which he would willingly set his Hand to. The Historian beforementioned says, it was uncertain whether he knew what was contained in the Articles they offer'd him to subscribe; but that he never intended, by what he had said, to renounce Episcopacy and acknowledge Presbyterian Parity, is, I think, abundantly evident from this very Consideration; for "when it was told him (says *Spotswood*) that such a Recantation was publish'd in his Name, he complain'd heavily of the Wrong that was done him, and committing his Cause to God, ended his Days in the End of this Year". Let the Reader by the way observe, that this is one Instance among a thousand others, of the very unfair Practice of the Presbyterian Zealots. But to proceed. In this same Year 1591, there happen'd a most notorious Schism in the Presbytery of St. Andrews, about the placing of Ministers, which was look'd upon to be ominous; and that the Government which in the Beginning did thus break out into Schisms, cou'd not long continue. And this every Man noted, ² THAT OF ALL MEN, NONE COU'D ENDURE PARITY, AND LOVED MORE TO COMMAND, THAN THEY WHO HAD INTRODUC'D IT INTO THE CHURCH.

In the next Year, viz. 1592, The Presbyterians having clos'd up the Schism before spoken of, and supposing that Matters were now brought to such a Maturity, and their Party so much strengthen'd that an Establishment might be obtain'd, they presented a Petition for this Purpose to the Parliament which met in *June*; wherein, among other things, it was requested, that the Acts of Parliament made in 1584, beforementioned, in behalf of Episcopacy, and against the Enchroachments of Presbyterian Discipline, might be ^a "abrogated and annulled,

^a Spotsw. 386.

² Spotsw. 388.

" and

" and a Ratification granted of the Discipline " whereof they were then in Practice". This Petition was long debated, and the King foreseeing the Inconveniences of it, was extremely unwilling to grant it, but was at last forc'd to do it, upon the account of *Bothwell's* Business, and other Discontents in the Kingdom: But it ought to be remark'd, that tho' the Act, upon the said Necessity, was pass'd, yet it pass'd " in the most wary Terms " that cou'd be devised". So that here we may lay our Finger, that Presbytery was establish'd but upon mere Force (on the score of sad Distractions and Confusions then in *Scotland*) and with the greatest Reluctancy imaginable. The Presbyterians having thus procur'd their upstart Government to be establish'd by Law, it appears by his Majesty's Articles which he sent to the Assembly at *Dundee*, which met in *April* 1593, that they grew exceeding turbulent and seditious; insomuch that by the 2^d of those Articles, he desires the Assembly ^b "to make an Act inhibiting Ministers " to declaim in Pulpit against the Proceeding of " his Majesty and Council, under Pain of Deprivation". But what the Assembly did in that Particular, was so slight and unsatisfactory, that he look'd upon it " To be no Restraint, but rather to " minister an Excuse to the unruly Sort when they " transgress'd, than otherwise". In short, this Assembly presum'd to meddle in State Affairs, (properly so call'd) to give Rules and Directions about Traffick and Merchandize, and to interfere with the Business of the Civil Magistrate; so that it was a Saying at Court, " That Rascals and ^c Sow-tars could obtain at the Ministers Hands what " the King could not in Matters more reasonable". When his Majesty complain'd to the Assembly of

^b Spotsw. 406.

^c Shoemakers.

several

several irreverent and treasonable Speeches utter'd from the Pulpit, and particularly by one *John Ross*, little or no Notice was taken of it; he was only slightly admonish'd to be more discreet for the future, that there might be no farther Complaint. So far were these pious, godly Ministers from being loyal and obedient Subjects (after all the Kindness the King had shew'd 'em) that they encourag'd the People not only privately, but publickly and openly in their Sermons, to join with them, and to favour and assist *Bothwell* in his Rebellion; nay, they actually sent one ^d Mr. *Andrew Hunter* to attend *Bothwell* as his Chaplain. Nor did their Folly and Madness subsist here, as my Historian expresses it, but they gave the Money, which had been collected for the Supply of *Geneva*, then in Distress, to *Robert Melvil*, and *George Strong*, two Captains, to buy Soldiers with against the King. And though the King afterwards complain'd of the said *Hunter* to the Assembly, for having brought a Scandal upon their Profession, by being an open Traytor to a Christian King of their own Religion, and their natural Sovereign, for which notorious Crime he desir'd he might be excommunicated; yet all his Majesty could obtain, was, that he should be ^e "Depos'd from the Ministry, as a *Defertor* of his Flock, and one *suspected* to have "join'd himself with the King's Rebels". That his Majesty did not in the least make his Condition better, by establishing Presbytery, is easy to be observ'd from the whole Series of the History of those Times, but as it does not immediately relate to the present Argument, I shall therefore wave it, and refer the Reader, for particular Satisfaction, to a late Pamphlet call'd, *The Rise and Growth of Fanaticism*: Price 6d. where he will have a VIEW of

^d Spotf. 403.^e Spotf. 406.

the PRINCIPLES, PLOTS, and pernicious PRACTICES of the Presbyterians for upwards of 150 Years. In the mean time that the case of ^f Mr. *David Blake*, which I mention'd in my Invalidity of Lay-baptism, was so notoriously a flying in the Face of Authority, and such an open Contempt of it, as 'tis hardly to be parallel'd: and what is still an higher Aggravation, the Proceedings against him were represented to affect the whole Ministry; so that *Blake's* Cause was labour'd to be made the Cause of the Kirk, and as such it was supported, and encourag'd, and argu'd for, against the Government. The Pulpits rang with bitter Invectives against the King's Proclamations, ^g and the People were stirred up to Mutiny and Sedition. Some cried out to Arms, others to bring out *Haman*; (for whilst the Lords were with the King, Mr. *Michael Cranstone*, Minister of *Cramond* had been reading to the People that Story) others cried, "The Sword of the Lord, and of Gideon"; several rush'd into the Presence Chamber, and had not the King left the Room, and retir'd to another place, it was verily believ'd that He, and his Ministers of State had been murder'd. After this Disappointment the Faction met, the Ministers continu'd to rail against the King, and particularly one Mr. *John Welsh*, told the People from the Pulpit, "That the King was possess'd with the Devil, and one Devil being put out, seven worse were entred in Place: and that the Subjects might lawfully rise, and take the Sword out of his hand." And those that took up Arms, were justified for so doing by some Ministers, who, in a Letter to my Lord *Hamilton*, affirm'd that they were animated by the word, and motion of God's Spirit, to go to Arms;

^f See the Charge, and Proceedings at large. Spot. p. 420, to 428.^g Spotfwood, p. 424, 429, 432.

and farther in the same Letter they desire his Lordship to come to *Edinburgh*, and shew his Affection to the *good Cause*, and to accept the Honour they offer'd him, of being their Head, "for that they wanted a Head, and special Noble-men to countenance the Matter."

Thus did the Presbyterian Party in these, and many more Instances behave themselves with an amazing Insolence and Disloyalty towards their lawful Sovereign. But as the divine Providence extracts Good from Evil, *i. e.* as He makes that which is design'd for Mischief turn to our Advantage; so the Faction and Rebellion of these Sinners against their own Souls; of these *Corabites* and Usurpers upon Episcopacy, produc'd this good effect, as to make the King repent of that Act of Establishment, and entertain thoughts of restoring the Ancient, and only true Government of the Church by Bishops. ^h "He long'd to see a decent Order establish'd in the Church, such as agreed with the Word of God, the allowable Custom of the Primitive Times, and the Laws of the Country." And for this He thought no Time so proper as when the Assembly met at *Perth*, *Anno* 1596. Accordingly He propos'd 55 Articles by way of Question, which manifestly condemn'd the Abuses which were crept into the Presbyterian Discipline; and of this the Sticklers for this Discipline were so sensible, that it was a very great Concern to them, that that Discipline should be disputed, which they had always declar'd "*was a Part of the Gospel*;" so that it was resolv'd upon at their many private Conferences on this occasion, that by all means a Dispute upon that Subject must be prevented. But notwithstanding

^h Spotswood, p. 435.

the Opposition made by some of the Presbyterian Zealots, the King prevail'd for a Determination of several of those Articles, as appears by the sequel of the *Scottish History*.

They were extremely afraid of letting the Matter come to the Test, lest the *Truth* should be discover'd. *Truth* is never ashamed of coming to the Light, but *Error* always is; they had reason enough to suspect, that Scripture and Antiquity were both against them, and if they reflected upon the original of their Novel Scheme, they cou'd not possibly trace it higher than *John Melvil*, who had brought it over as a Rarity under his Cloak from *Geneva*.

A Reformation was made among the ⁱ Factious Ministers, and those who were more peaceable were plac'd in their room. Then in the Year 1598, He was very earnest that the Clergy should be admitted to sit in Parliament, as being one of the Estates of the Kingdom, and accordingly an Act was pass'd, ^k "That such Ministers as His Majesty should please to provide to the Place, Title and Dignity of a Bishop, Abbot, or other Prelate, at any time should have Voice in Parliament, as freely as any other Ecclesiastical Person had at any time by-past; and that the Bishopricks, then in His Majesty's Hands, or which should happen to fall void thereafter, should be only disposed to actual Preachers and Ministers in the Church." The Assembly which met afterwards in *March*, at *Dundee*, approv'd of this Design, and it was agreed, that there should be 51 Persons to sit in Parliament, as there had been in times of Popery. But here it

ⁱ Spotsw. p. 448, to 454. ^k Calderwood owns, p. 426, that *Anno* 1598, there were Assertors of Episcopacy, who urg'd the Necessity of Imposition of Hands by Bishops only.

is not to be dissembled; (nor am I concern'd to do it,) that there were afterwards several Cautions made, lest the new Bishops should assume too great a Power; which Caveats for preventing Corruption, (for that was the name) the King for the present admitted, till a more favourable opportunity should offer it self. For as Archbishop *Spotswood* expressly tells us, p. 454. "It was neither the King's Intention, nor the Minds of the wisest sort to have these Cautions stand in force, but to have matters peaceably ended, and the Reformation of the Policy made without Noise. The King gave way to these Conceits, knowing that with time the Utility of the Government which he purposed to have established, would appear; and trusting, that they whom he should place in these rooms, would, by their Care for the Church, and their wise and good Behaviour, purchase to themselves the Authority which appertained." (That is) in one word, He and the Friends of Episcopacy doubted not, but after this Point was gained, the ancient Episcopal Government would be in time restored, and therefore he allowed their *Caveats* till he could be able to rescind them, as he actually did, not long after. And so the Conclusions taken at *Falkland* in July, 1598, were ratified, and the business of the Bishop's Voice in Parliament was determined in an Assembly where the King was present, at *Montrose* the 28th of March, 1600; and pursuant to the Agreement, several Persons were nominated to the Bishopricks then vacant; but to those of *Aberdeen* and *Glasgow* there were none presented, and the Reason was, because those Sees

¹ *Spotsw. p. 457, 458. Calderwood owns, p. 441. that in this Year, 1600, by the Agreement at Montrose, Episcopacy was brought in cover'd with Caveats.*

were then filled with their own Incumbents, both actual Preachers; *i. e.* they were true Bishops, as I conceive, and not *Laymen*, or *Titulars* only, as those were who had got Possession of the Revenues of some Bishopricks, upon the Abolition of Episcopacy. Among those who were presented to the vacant Sees, Mr. *David Lindesay* was presented to *Rosse*, and Mr. *George Gladstaves* to *Cathness*; both which continued to serve their former Cure of *Leith* and *St. Andrews*; having not for the present a convenience of Residence in their respective Dioceses ^m.

Besides this Act for the Advantage of Episcopacy, there were several other good Acts concluded, which Archbishop *Spotswood* does not give us any particular account of, but refers us to the Book of Records, whether the Persons which by the Act aforesaid were collated to the vacant Bishopricks, were consecrated to the Office of a Bishop, by true Bishops, as ours in *England* are, and as Bishops in *Scotland* before were. The Historian does not that I can find, inform us; nor is it, I think, very material to the business now under Consideration, whether they were consecrated by Bishops or no; for if it can be proved, that there were either true Presbyters, or Deacons Episcopally ordained to administer the Sacrament of Baptism, it is certainly sufficient to the present purpose. But yet I cannot but observe, that there are some particular passages in *Spotswood*, which seem plainly to intimate that those Bishops were consecrated, as our English Bishops are, after their Election. For it is to be noted, that before the matter came under debate in the Convention, Mr. *Drury* Minister of *Montrose*, a Man of an extraordinary good Character (as may be seen at large in *Spotsw.*

^m *Spotsw. p. 458.*

wood) being upon his Death-bed, told several Ministers, that he *earnestly* wish'd to have lived unto the meeting of the Assembly, that he might have declared his Mind touching the Matters then in hand; but since he could not live till then, he entreated his Brethren whom he had desired to visit him, "To tell the Assembly as from him, "that there was a Necessity of restoring the ancient Government of the Church [*id est*, by true Bishops as it was before and for many years after the Reformation] "because of the Unruliness of young Ministers that could not be advised by the elder sort, nor kept in Order; and "since both the Estate of the Church did require it, and the King did labour to have the same revived, he wish'd 'em to make no Trouble therefore, and to insist only with the King that the best Ministers and of the greatest Experience might be preferred to Places." And this advice, as the Historian observes, was "well receiv'd by the greatest part of the Assembly;" so that since the Majority concurred with the King's Request, is it not a probable Inference or Deduction that true Episcopacy was restored? "Besides, about five Years after this, some Ministers who still liked a Licentious Presbyterian Government, "intended to call in question all the Conclusions taken in former Assemblies for the Episcopal Government," but were by the King prevented; and does not this carry a strong Probability that the true Episcopacy had been for some time established, since they were so much enraged at it? Moreover at an Assembly held at Glasgow, ^o Anno 1610, it was concluded that Synods in every Diocese should be moderated by the Bishop: That the Sentence of Excommunication

ⁿ Spotfw. p. 486.

^o Spotfw. p. 512.

and

and Absolution should be pronounced by the Bishop's Approbation and Direction: That every Minister at his Admission should swear Obedience to the King, and to his Ordinary, according to the Form agreed upon, Anno 1571, as the Clergy of the Church of *England* do; and that the Visitation should be made by the Bishop; and that whatever Minister absents himself from the Visitation or Diocesan Assembly, shall be *Suspended* from his Office and Benefice, and if he does not amend, *Deprived*: That the Convention of Ministers shall be moderated by the Bishops; and lastly, (and what deserves a particular Observation) "it was ordained that no Minister should speak "against any of the aforesaid Conclusions in publick, nor dispute the question of Equality or Inequality of Ministers, as tending only to the entertaining of Schism in the Church, and Violation of the Peace thereof". And now will not all this be allowed to be something more than a probable Conjecture? Will it not amount to an Argument to prove that Episcopacy was the established Government? And especially if the Form in 1571 was followed, then *surely* it will be granted that the same Episcopacy was established *now* as was *then*; and that *true* Episcopacy both as to the Name and Thing, (that is to say) *real*, and not *nominal*, or *titular*, was the Government of the Church in the Year 1571, is plain from what has been discoursed above. Supposing then that *true* Episcopacy were restored Anno 1600; then, I presume, I may argue that there were Persons who had received Episcopal Ordination; and consequently I may assert, against the Bishop of *Oxford's* Assertion, that there were Persons (besides those who had only Presbyterian Orders) who were empowered to baptize King *James's* Children; and consequently that neither King

James, nor any other Person that shall maintain the Invalidity of Lay-baptism, does thereby unchristian his Children, and particularly King *Charles* the First; as Mr. *Shaw* after the Example of his Lordship is pleased to say we do. For if what I have now observed on this Subject be laid together, and impartially considered, then I doubt not, it will clearly appear to the Conviction of all unprejudiced Persons who search for Truth, that there was a true Episcopal Government in *Scotland*, both before, and for many Years after the Reformation. And when the Presbyterian Government, a Government of very late Date, and novel Extraction, had, by Sedition and Treason dethroned *that* which is of divine Institution, and stoln away the Hearts of the giddy Mobile; yet it is observable that there were Bishops even in *those* times, who doubtless kept up the Succession, and had ordained a considerable Number of Presbyters and Deacons for the Service of the Church. For at the same time that we read of the exorbitant Exercise of Power by the Presbyterians, we also read of several Bishops, not Papists only, but the reformed also, who were often convened before the Assembly, Synod, or Presbytery, and were censured and deposed from their Function, for not acknowledging Presbyterian *Parity*, and not submitting to its mock Authority. When the Queen was to be Crowned, and the Presbyterians refused to anoint her according to the ancient Ceremony, You have seen that the King threatned 'em into Compliance, by telling 'em that he would send for one of the Bishops who would not refuse it. When the King's Children were born, there was a very great

^p Note, The Queen was crowned in the Year 1590, which was three Years before the Prince, viz. Henry, was born; at the

great Difference between the King and the Presbyterian Ministers, because they had been seditious, and had assisted and encouraged several Rebellions; so that it is by no means probable, that he would employ any of *them* to administer Baptism to his Children.

Besides, what tends very much to *heighten* this Improbability, is the Consideration that when Prince *Charles* was born, the King had actually presented several Persons to the vacant Bishopricks, had allow'd em Voices in Parliament; and in a word, was restoring the ancient Government, as

*the time of whose Birth the Presbyterian Ministers were in Rebellion against the King, as above, and assisted Bothwell; and therefore it is not probable the King would admit any of that Stamp so near him as to baptize his Child, [And see p. 406, of Spotswood, concerning Rossie and Hunter.] Six Years after was the Birth of the Princess Elizabeth; at the time of whose Birth the Business of Blake before-mentioned was discussed. The Presbyterian Ministers espoused his Cause against the King; and therefore it is not probable he would employ any of those seditious Men to administer Baptism. And eight Years after was the Birth of another Daughter Margaret, who was baptized (as Spotswood expressly tells us) by Mr. David Lindesay, who had received true Episcopal Ordination, as I shall shew by and by. And ten Years after was the Birth of Prince Charles; at the time of whose Birth the Presbyterians were in Disgrace, and several Ministers were ordered to remove from Edinburgh. The King had expressed his Desire to restore the Ancient Government by Bishops, and had accordingly presented several to fill the Vacant Bishopricks. So that upon the whole matter, there is not the least Probability that he would procure any other than an Episcopal Minister to baptize his Child. And when it is consider'd that the Bishop of Ross, (viz.) Lindesay, was in * great Favour with the King, and returned publick Thanks for his Deliverance from the Gowry Conspiracy about that time, which the Presbyterians refused to do; it will appear to be something more than a Probability that the King would employ him, before any of his Presbyterian Rebellious Subjects, who deserved to be banished from his Presence for ever.*

* Calderwood acknowledges p. 155, of his History, that Mr. David Lindesay was of all the Ministers the most gracious at Court.

much as he possibly could, to its former flourishing Condition. And all this he did *purely* from *Principle*, and *Affection* to Episcopacy; for as appears from several Incidents, and particularly from the Passages of his Book before mentioned, (and *which* was printed the Year before his Son *Charles* was born) he look'd upon Presbytery to be an *usurp'd*, mischievous Government. "*Parity* (says he) is the "MOTHER OF CONFUSION, and ENEMY TO UNITY, which is the MOTHER OF ORDER, &c." How can it then be *rationaly* suppos'd, that he would make use of any of these *unauthorized* Administrators, if any other could possibly be procur'd? Once more, when Prince *Henry's* Baptism was solemniz'd, we are expressly told by Archbishop *Spotswood*, that he was presented by the English Ambassador, the Earl of *Suffex*, in the Presence of the Ambassadors of *Denmark*, *Mecklenburgh*, &c. to Mr. *David Cunningham*, a Bishop of *Aberdeen*, who was appointed to administer that Sacrament. When the Princess *Elizabeth* was baptized, the Magistrates of *Edinburgh* were Witnesses; the English Ambassador named her after the Queen his Mistress. Another Daughter was baptized by Mr. *David Lindeſay*; the Earl of *Montroſſe*, Lord *Hamilton*, and Earl of *Huntley* were Witnesses. And tho' there is no account given by *Spotswood*, of the Solemnity of Prince *Charles's* Baptism, nor is the Name of the *Administrator* so much as mention'd, yet from all the foregoing Circumstances, it is highly probable, that he was baptized by one that had received Episcopal Ordination; and by whom so likely as by *Lindeſay* Bishop of *Ross*, for whom the King had, very deservedly, a great Esteem and Veneration? And tho' what the most Reverend Histo-

^a Spotsw. p. 407.

^r Spotsw. p. 424, 425.

rian says concerning this Prince, is exceeding short, [for he says only, that the Queen was brought to Bed of a Son at *Dumfermlin*, that his Name was *Charles*, that his Christening was hastened by reason of the Weakness of the Child, and that his Death was much fear'd,] yet I doubt not, there was the same Solemnity at his Baptism, as at any of the other Children. For it is to be consider'd, that all the *Scottish* Historians are supposed to be defective in several Points (as an inquisitive Reader may discover) and Archbishop *Spotswood* himself, (tho' an excellent Historian,) has omitted to clear *some* particulars. This of King *Charles's* Baptism I reckon to be one, and I cannot but say, that it is a matter of my Wonder that he should give us so short an Account of it. To supply therefore this Defect, and to leave my argument of *Probability*, which was all that in my Book I contended for, I proceed now *2dly*, to shew positively, that King *Charles* the *First* was baptized by a right *Episcopally* ordained Administrator of Baptism.

Now this does fully and clearly appear from a large account of the whole *Solemnity*, which is to be seen in the *Lyon-Office* at *Edinburgh*, written and enter'd there by *John Blinſele*, *Hay-Herald*, who was present at the publick Baptism of King *Charles* the first. Of which account this is the Substance, so far at least, as it relates to the present Controversy.

PRINCE CHARLES was Born in the Palace of *Dumfermlin* in the Kingdom of *Scotland*, on the Nineteenth Day of *November*, ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED: He was Baptized by Mr. *David Lindeſay* Bishop of *Ross*, and Minister of *Leith*, upon the TWENTY THIRD DAY of *December* following. His Gossips or Sureties were two French Noblemen; Monsieur de *Roban* of *Brittaine*, and his Brother Monsieur de *Sibbois*, and the

the Lady Marchioness of *Huntley*; she bare the Bairn [*i. e.* Child] in the Place of *Nurrine* [*i. e.* Nurse] within the Pall at the time of Sermon; which was preached on this solemn Occasion, by the said Bishop *Lindesay*, from these Words of St. *Paul's* Epistle to the *Romans*, Chap. xiii. ver. 11. *And that knowing the Time, that now it is high Time to awake out of Sleep, for now is our Salvation nearer than when we believed.*

This, I assure my Reader, is a faithful Abstract of the large Account which lately came from *Scotland*; and for the Attestation of it, I am able, were it necessary, to produce some Gentlemen of Distinction and Figure, and undoubted Credit, who have seen the Account, and know it to be true; and perhaps the World may shortly see it, and some other Papers which set some of the *Scottish* Affairs in a clearer Light than they have yet appear'd in, to the entire Mortification of all Opponents.

And now since the Relation I have here given, is from a publick Record, entred by a proper Notary or Officer, there is all imaginable Reason for Credibility and Assent, that in such a case as this, so remote from the present Age, can be desired; and with this kind of Evidence, every unprejudiced and considerate Man must, and will be satisfy'd. But that the Presbyterians are extremely averse (or at least seem to be so) to believe any thing how clear and demonstrative soever, that makes against them, no body can be ignorant that knows them. And since they, or their Friends and Abettors in our own Communion, will be ready to catch at any thing (as *Mendo* at the smallest Twig when they are drowning) to support a *sinking* Cause, I shall therefore watchfully anticipate an Objection which 'tis not impossible may be made. If then it be objected, that *Lindesay* before mentioned,

tioned, was a *Titular* or *Nominal* Bishop only, and had not receiv'd Episcopal Consecration. To that I answer, that, *ex hypothesi*, if this Suggestion be allowed to be an Argument, then at this Rate of arguing, all Persons who in all Ages have been Bishops, may be said to be only *Titulars*, (directly contrary to all ancient Writers, who prove that they exercised Episcopal Authority within their respective Jurisdictions) and so by this way of reasoning, Presbyters also as well as Bishops, may be made *Titulars* only, and so consequently the Cause of *Deism* be promoted. For thus an Enemy to all Divine Institutions, may argue that those that are styl'd Priests in Scripture or Antiquity, were only called so, had only the *Style* and *Title*, as they perform'd Religious Offices for others, but were not ordained so by any Imposition of Hands, and consequently were not Priests in *reality*, but were Priests only in the same sense that a Master of a Family may be called so, *i. e.* as he instructs and prays with and for his Family. But if such an Argument or Inference in a *Deist* would not be allowed to be good (even the Presbyterians themselves, who pretend to a *Divine* Original, being Judges :) If they would not think it conclusive in Prejudice to the Office of the Ministry, why should the same argument in *them* be conclusive against Episcopacy? If it be confessed to be a bad Argument in one case, why not in another?

But 2dly, this *Lindesay* was made Bishop; as I said, in 1600, about nine Months before King *Charles* was baptiz'd. And from what I have observ'd above, I leave it to the Reader to judge, whether he was not more than a *Titular* Bishop? Whether he had not the Episcopal Office and Authority? See p. 53, &c. of this Discourse.

And if all Ministers were obliged to swear Obedience to the King and Ordinary, according to the

the Form *Anno 1571, i.e.* according to the Constitution of the Church at that time, which I have shew'd was Episcopal; then it will follow by a natural and necessary Consequence, that the Constitution when *Lindesay* was made Bishop, was Episcopal, and then there's an End of the Controversy. For if the Constitution in 1571, was the Rule for the Church to be govern'd by in 1600, when Episcopacy was restored, then it is but enquiring what the Constitution was, and how it stood in 1571, and the matter is fully clear'd: and that true Episcopacy was in being in 1571, I hope, I have made appear above, when I spoke to that Period. But to put the matter if possible beyond all Doubt, I shall here observe a word or two from another account sent me touching that Affair. The worthy Gentleman whose Name I omit, because I have no leave to mention it, speaks thus.

" No sooner was the Bishop of *St. Andrews* and some others of the Popish Bishops dead, but the Government and the Church resolved to return to the ancient Government by Bishops, and fill up all the Vacant Sees. To this purpose an Agreement was made in 1571, during the Regency of the Earl of *Marr*, between the Church and State, whereby Episcopacy is restor'd, and declared to be the ancient and true Church Government. There the form of *Conge de Eslire* is settled, the Oaths the Bishops should take are expressly set down, and the Powers both of Jurisdiction and Ordination former Bishops had, are vested in the Bishops now to be chosen. It is likewise by this Agreement settled who shall be the Chapter that shall chuse the Bishop; and because several of their Livings, whose Ministers were Members of the Chapter, were still pos-

“ fessed

“ fessed by Popish Incumbents, therefore it is agreed that during the Lives of such Popish Incumbents, some other Ministers within the same Diocese, and particularly named in the Agreement, should in the interim have the Power of Electing their Bishops. In pursuance of this Agreement, *Douglas* was made Archbishop of *St. Andrews*, *Creighton* was made Bishop of *Dunkeld*, and *Graham* Bishop of *Dumblane*. In short, all the vacant Bishopricks were filled up with Protestant Clergy-men.

The worthy Person who gives this Account, adds farther, that he had seen the Original Agreement: That there were then three or two Bishops at least in *Scotland*, who had left the Church of *Rome*, and reformed: That there were two, is agreed by all their Historians, and is plain from their Records. “ He says that tho' *Knox* mentions this matter very overtly, yet, if I forget not, says he, he mentions the Bishop of *Orkney* to be present at the Consecration of these new Bishops; and if he was there, then there is no room to question that he officiated according to his Character”. But not to lay any Stress upon this matter; put the Case that *Lindesay* was no true Bishop, but a *Titular* or *Nominal* one only, if it can be proved that he was a true Presbyter, or Priest, or Deacon, regularly and rightly Ordained by a true Bishop, then consequently he was *Commissioned* to baptize: and *this* I doubt not, the Presbyterians themselves allow. Now had *Lindesay* been no more than a Deacon, he might baptize, as we know *St. Philip* did, whilst he was only Deacon at *Samaria*, Acts viii. So that such his Baptism would have been true Ministerial, and not *Lay Baptism*. But that he was a true Priest, I affirm, and assure the World upon very good Authority. Whilst he was in the

Romish

Romish Communion, he had receiv'd the Orders of Priesthood; and what is a full Evidence that he had done so, is this very Consideration, which the Account I have received mentions, (*viz.*) that in those Books which were published by the Papists to vindicate Popery, and asperse and disparage the Reformation, He is called by way of Reproach [“AN APOSTATE PRIEST”] for the Truth of which and the other particulars, there are very authentick Testimonies to be produced, which, as I said, will e're long be published. When the Reformation was established, 1560, and Ministers were appointed for the *Burghs*, this same *Lindesay* who was become a Convert was settled at *Leith*, as *Knox*, *Spotswood* and *Sage* assure us, where he continued to be Minister (tho' he was afterwards Bishop * of *Ross*) to his Death. He lived to a great Age, for he was fourscore and two or three Years old when he died; so that by Computation he was about the *Sixty Eighth* Year of his Age when he baptized King *Charles*. But to draw towards a Conclusion of this Argument; with regard to the present Dispute about King *Charles's* Baptism; it is not necessary to insist that *Lindesay* was a true Bishop; for if he was a Priest, as I have shew'd he was, then consequently he was authorized to baptize, and his Baptism by Virtue of his Ordination must be valid; for tho' he had receiv'd his Orders in the Communion of the *Romish* Church; yet it is allow'd that Orders so received are good; and it is observable that the Clergy at the Reformation here, were never re-ordained upon their Conversion, nor are any converted Clergymen now a-days ever re-ordained, as we know the *French* Ministers and those Pretenders to Holy Orders are here, who leave the *Schism*, and

* 1614.

unite with the *Church*; and what is the reason of this? why, because the *Popish* Bishops have received a true Ordination themselves, and consequently can communicate the same to others; and tho' I grant it, the *Romish* Church is notoriously corrupt and erroneous, yet 'tis still a *true* Church, tho' an *unsound* one; as a Man may be said to be a *true* Man, tho' a Leper.

Wherefore my Lord of *Sarum* that now is, if he acknowledges the Divine right of Bishops, which our Church maintains, as I suppose he does, then surely he will not, after all that has been said, assert that King *James's* Children (of which number good King *Charles* was one) “had been Baptized by Ministers who had only Presbyterian Orders in *Scotland*”. Nor is there any reason for the Dissenting Teacher's Inference, that King *Charles* was no Christian, according to the modern *High-Church* notion, as he scornfully calls the Doctrine of the true Church of *England*; nor was there any occasion for his *Puritanical* Fleer at that *justly* deserved Title of *Blessed* Martyr, which our Church gives him in the Office for the 30th of *January*. Indeed had he not been Baptized at all, the Doctrine I maintain, had not been in the least injured by his Infelicity, because (as I said) the determination of the Controversie of Lay-Baptism, does not turn upon any Man's Baptism, whatsoever it is. But had he never been Baptized at all with Water, we all know, that the *Fanatics* took care to Baptize him in his own Blood. And therefore considering that the Cause he died for was *Religion*, there is reason enough to give *Him* the Title of a *blessed* Martyr. Wherefore upon the whole matter, I humbly conceive that his Lordship will believe that he has by *his* assertion injured the *Blessed* Martyr; and therefore 'tis to be hoped that he will as *publickly* do him

him Justice. It may be reasonably enough presumed that he will have an opportunity of doing so this Summer, in his Diocesan Visitation ; and as the reflection was deliver'd in the Charge at Oxford, so I hope to see a Vindication in *That* at Salisbury. Both his Lordship and the Dissenting Teacher ought either to retract their Assertion, or defend it.



A N



A N
ACCOUNT
OF THE
BIRTH and BAPTISM
OF
King Charles I.

UPon Wednesday betwixt eleven and twelve Hours at Even, the 19th Day of November 1600, the Queens Majesty was delivered within the Palace of Dunfermling of a Manchild. God of his Mercy make him his Servant ; give him long and prosperous Days to live both to God's Glory, and to the Welfare of the Country.

Upon Tuesday the 23d of December 1600, the the King's Majesty came from his Chamber to the Chappel-Royal, convoyed by thir Noblemen, viz. the Marquess of Huntly, the Earls of Montrose Chancelour, Castils, Mar and Winton, with sundry Lords and other Noblemen, my Lord Lyon,
E 2 Sir

Sir George Douglas of Ellon, Knit, who supplied the Place of William Shaw, Master of Ceremonies, John Blinfele Ilay Herald, James Borthwick Rothsay Herald, and Thomas Williamson Ross Herald, Daniel Graham Dingwal Pursevant, William Makison Bute Pursevant, and David Gardner Ormond Pursevant: Our Coats of Arms displayed, Trumpets sounding before us, convoyed his Majesty to the Chappel-Royal. And there his Majesty was placed on the East Geivil of the Chappel. And thereafter my Lord Lyon and Master of Ceremonies, Herald, Pursevants and Trumpets came to the Queens Chamber, and there was a Pall of Gold, Silver and Silk, very magnificent, wrought (as it was spoken) by his Majesty's Umqⁿ Mother of good Memory, which was sustained and born by six Knights, viz. the Knight of Edzell, the Knight of Diddup at one end, the Knights of Trequair and Ormiston at the other end, and in the midst of the Pall on every side, the Knight of Black Ormiston, called Sir Mark Ker of Ormiston, and William Balinden of Broughton, and within the Pall the Bairn, born by Monsieur de Rohan a Nobleman of Brittany, who bare the Bairn in his Arms from the Chamber to the Chappel; and on every side of the said Monsieur de Rohan, his Brother called Monsieur * de Soubise, and on the other side of him the Marquess of Huntly, and behind him my Lord Livingston, who bare up the Bairn's Robe Royal of Purple Velvet, lyned with Damask. The Bairn was covered with Cloath of Gold and Lawn. And behind the Dames of Honour, the Marquess of Huntlies Wife, the Countess of Mar, with the Wives of my Lord Treasurer, President Secretary, with many other Dames of Honour. And before the Pall was the Bairn's Honours born; viz. my Lord Pre-

* Or Sibbois.

sident bare the Crown Ducal, my Lord Spynie bare the Lawver and Towel, my Lord Roxbrugh bare the Basin, my Lord Lyon, Master of Ceremonies, Herald with our Coats displayed, Trumpets sounding before us, with sundry other Noblemen: We ranked to the Chappel till we came befor his Majesty: And there on the North-side of the said Chappel the Pall and Bairn was placed, the Lady Marchioness of Huntly bare the Bairn instead of the Nourrice, within the said Pall all the time of the Sermon. On the East-side of the said Pall was two Chairs of Gramoisie Velvet, where the two Brothers sat beneath his Majesty on his Majesties Right-hand; and upon the West-side of the Pall sat these Noblemen, The Marquess of Huntly, Chancelour, Cassils, Mar, Winton, Treasurer, Secretary, Clerk Register, Advocat, and sundry other Noblemen of the secret Council. Upon the South-side of the Chappel, my Lords Livingston, Spynie, President Roxbrugh, and sundry other Noblemen, and the Servants of the two Frenchmen who were his Majesty's Gossips.

The Sermon and Baptism was made by Mr. David Lindsay Bishop of Ross, and Minister of Lieth, which was upon Romans xiii. xi. The time of the Sermon being ended, Mr. David Lindsay declared it over again in French, to the two Frenchmen that were Gossips. And thereafter he proceeded to the Baptism of the Bairn. The Pall and Bairn was brought to the Pulpit born by the said Monsieur De Rohan, and his Majesty came from his Place to the said Pulpit with the said Noblemen. And the Minister baptized him, naming him CHARLES.

And then after a Psalm sung and Blessing said, my Lord Lyon proclaimed his Styles and called him, My Lord Charles of Scotland, Duke of Albany,

Marquess of Ormond, Earl of Ross, Lord Ardmagh. And thereafter Dingwal Pursevant, Pursevant, proclaim'd his Styles out of the West Windowe of the said Chappel, crying with a lowd Voice, Largefs of the Right High and Excellent Prince my Lord Charles of Scotland, Duke of Albany, Marquess of Ormond, Earl of Ross, Lord of Ardmannoch, Largefs, Largefs, Largefs; and thereafter John Blinsele Hay, Herald, did cast out of the said Windowe one hundred Marks of Silver to the Poor of the Duke's Largefs. Trumpets sounding, the Castle shot nine Canons. His Majesty ranked from the Chappel to the Chamber as he did before, the Pall Bairn and Honours were born, the Lords Dames ranked from the Chappel to the Queens Chamber; the Gossip Monsieur de Rohan bare the Bairn, as he did to the Kirk, my Lord Lyon, Master of Ceremonies, Herald Pursevants, Trumpets sounding before us.

And thereafter his Majesty passed to the mikle Hall to Supper, His Majesty sat on her Majesties Left-hand, beneath his Majesty sat the two Brothers Frenchmen, where they were magnificently entertained. My Lord Mar was Great Master Household in place of the Earl of Argyle, Sir James Sandilands Mr. Uther in place of my Lord Fleming, Sir James Douglas served as Master of Ceremonies, in place of William Shaw. Sir Thomas Erskin Master of the Guards. My Lord Lyon served in his Coat at Supper, my Lord President served the King at Supper as Cupper, my Lord Spynie Carver, my Lord Roxburgh Sewer. Upon the West-side of the Hall, sat sundry Lords and Dames, and the two Frenchmens Servants, ay a Nobleman and a Dame placed: The Marquess of Huntly, Chancelour, Castils, Mar, Winton, Livingston, with sundry other Nobles.

Noblemen, and Lords of secret Council at the Board. Upon Wednesday at Even the two noble Frenchmen, and the Nobility supt with his Majesty.

This is copied from a M.S. in the Lyons Office, written by John Blinsele Hay Herald, who assisted at the Baptism.





POSTSCRIPT.



Our Author's Postscript, which, on many Accounts, is extremely obliging, I think fit to pay the Civility of a short Remark.

The modest and mannerly Language, so agreeable with that his whole Book is stuff'd with, and what I always expect from such a Writer, I shall not return, nor take any notice of, because 'tis utterly foreign to the Subject.

In answer to his Exceptions to my Assertion, I desire him to observe, that I am not singular in it, there being many that I could produce, eminent for their Skill in Antiquity, who have made "the same bold Affirmation, with the same unusual Confidence as I have done*" viz. that Episcopacy prevail'd over the Christian World from the beginning of Christianity; and that the Churches of Christ were govern'd by Bishops, for 1500 Years, till the Days of *John Calvin*. And it is as observable, that the greatest Advocates of Presbyterian Innovation, have not been able to confute that Assertion, any otherwise than by denying it, after the same rude manner our Author does.

But when Mr. *Sharw* has † "waded into An-

* See his Def.

† The reason, I suppose, is, least he should "wade" too far, or launch immediately into the Deep, and be lost.

"tiquity"

"tiquity" (to use his own Expression,) which he "confesses he has not yet done; When he has read the present Bishop of *Worcester's* Account of Church-Government in *Britain*, and the following Discourse. When he has carefully perus'd the Book entituled, *Ecclesiæ Sclavonicæ Bobemæ in Gente potissimum radicata Historiola*, §. 59, 60, 61, &c. And reviews what I have said, [p. 49, 50. *Invalidity*, &c.] concerning the *Bohemians*, and *Waldenses*, &c. In a Word, When he has duly consider'd the Folly and Absurdity of that modern Conceit, which the Presbyterians now borrow from the Independents, tho' inconsistent with their former Principles, he will, *must* indeed, acknowledge, if he has any Ingenuity, that his Instances of the ancient Church of *Scotland*, and *that* of *Piedmont*, are far from doing his Cause any Service.

Would our Author, and his Brother *Hartly*, be prevail'd upon to read some of our * *English* Writers I recommended, (for I would not trouble 'em any more with *Greek*, or *Latin*, since they do not care to read them) they must surely see their Error. Their Admirers too might see, would they *honestly* search for Truth, how much they are impos'd upon by them, and led into a most unreasonable Schism.

By a candid and impartial Perusal of those excellent Books, the true Government and Constitution of the Church of Christ, in the best and purest Ages, will clearly appear to be Episcopal, and particularly Dr. *Maurice* proves to a Demonstration, that Primitive Episcopacy was Diocesan, as *ours* is; that there were more Congregations than one in a City, and that they were under the Inspection, and

* Bishop Hall of Episcopacy. Dr. Potter on Church-Government. Divine Right of Episcopacy. Dr. Maurice's Diocesan Episcopacy. Dr. Wells's Treatises, &c.

Government of one Bishop. Nay, which is more, he gives divers Instances of Bishopricks, which were many hundred Miles in Circumference, comprehending even Provinces, and extending themselves to a very great length.

Now when all these things are seriously consider'd, I would willingly hope, that our Author, and * "his learned Friend" may observè, that the two small Treatises, and others of the same Stamp, recommended by them, give them and their Followers a very false Account of the primitive Episcopacy, and Constitution. And then surely, if they have Consciences *truly* tender, they must renounce their present Schism, and joyn sincerely in the Communion of the Church. And God grant 'em Grace to do it.

Here I design'd to have added a few Remarks upon Mr. *Hartly's* Vindication; but when I consider how much I have said upon Episcopacy already †; which, in the Judgment of those that understand Antiquity, and true Reasoning, he has not refuted, I need not add any more; especially when it is consider'd farther, that * Mr. *Sturges's* has undertaken that Province, and has return'd him a sufficient Answer.

The Instance I gave of "*Cornelius* Bishop of "*Rome*, and *the forty six Presbyters he had with him in that City*, Mr. *Sturges's* has also observ'd to Mr. *H.* and kindly pointed out the very Place where Mr. *H.* may find it, altho' he pretends he cannot find it by *my* Direction. So averse it seems are some Men to see their Errors, that they pur-

* Mr. *Hartly* a Dissenting Teacher at Ashby de la Zouch, in Leicestershire.

† P. 18, &c. Invalidity, &c.

* See his Discourse entituled, The Divine Right of Episcopacy.

posely shut their Eyes against the clearest Conviction.

As for the unbecoming Language, (to give it the softest Name,) which Mr. *H.* very freely bestows upon us, I shall not make any Remark upon it, because it has no relation, that I know of to the Argument; it only shews what Spirit and Party he is of.

To return therefore to Mr. *S.* I am at present concern'd with. If he designs to appear once more in print, there are a few things I crave leave to refresh his * good Memory with, and to which I may reasonably expect an Answer.

He may please then to remember, that I have urged several Authorities [See *Invalidity*, &c.] both from Scripture and Antiquity, against Presbyterian Ordination, and Lay-baptism; to which he may please too to remember, that he has return'd no Answer. Indeed to some Authorities from the Synodical Acts of the Reform'd Churches, &c. he has thought fit to say, that "Mr. *Cantrell's* quoting the Kirk of *Scotland*, and the Reform'd a-
" broad against me, allowing the Quotations to
" be true, (*and are they not true?*) can never be
" looked upon as binding to me: I cannot; but
" think all the Authorities he has produc'd from
" Presbyterians in favour of his Opinion are im-
" pertinent, nor do they in the least make for his
" Purpose." So that if the World will not allow these *meer Words*, utter'd with a magisterial Air, this wretched shuffling and evasion to be a solid Answer, this is all Mr. *S.* is able to present it with.

Instead of answering those Arguments which press hard upon his Cause, he has been amusing

* See Remarks on his two Sermons, p. 5. of Remarks on the second Sermon, margin.

himself and his Admirers with two Sermons (upon which Remarks have been made, and due notice taken of the extraordinary *Beauties* of the Style, and his retentive Memory,) but no Defence has he yet publish'd of the false Positions ^{they} ~~are~~ abound with. His Employment of late has been to advance a * Paradox, for now he undertakes to prove, that "our Church allows an inherent Right in the Presbyter's Office to ordain." But if he pleases to read the Answer to it, I doubt not he may be satisfy'd, that what he says, is not the Judgment of the Church, but a meer *Whim* of his own.

If he goes on with this trade of Paradoxes, the next thing I suppose he will attempt, will be to prove, from the Liturgy and the 55th Canon, that our Church prefers an extempore Effusion before a Form of Prayer; for one is as easy to be prov'd, as the other.

When he reviews his past Labours, I beg too he will consider how gross a Plagiary he has been in urging the Arguments of others without mentioning his Authors; and how unfair in taking no notice of the Answers. Let him too compare what he has said concerning Lay-baptism in the following Pages, viz. 24, 46, 47, 48, with Pages 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, & *passim*. of the Pamphlet falsely call'd, *The Judgment of the Church of England in the Case of Lay-baptism*; and then he will find, that (as good Wits will jump) they are in reality the same; only Mr. S. has been at the pains to transpose the Words, and to give "a different Turn to the Method and Expression," the better to disguise the Theft.

In short, his Book is made up of the Materials others have furnish'd him withal, and those too

* See his Treatise called, *The Judgment of the Church of England, &c.*

are taken from some * modern Writings, which have been again and again substantially answer'd and refuted.

And what is under his Name presented to the World, in relation to the *Scottish* History, is the very same which a Gentleman of our own Communion, has often mention'd to myself and others; who was so much Mr. *Shaw's* Friend, that he put Papers into his Hands; and gave him no farther trouble than to get a young Probationer for Presbyterian Orders to transcribe them for the Press.

* *Bishop Burnet's Sermons. The Bishop of Sarum's Charge at Oxford, 1712. Mr. Bingham's Scholastical History. Dissuasive from Jacobitism.*

F I N I S.



CONTENTS

OF THE

BOOK.

<i>AN Argument drawn from Consequences not conclusive in the present dispute of Lay-baptism.</i>	Page 1
<i>A Recapitulation of what I have urged for the true Episcopal Baptism of King Charles I.</i>	3
<i>Bishops in Scotland before the Reformation.</i>	6
<i>Bishops after the Reformation.</i>	7
<i>This Point granted by Presbyterians, as appears from Bishop Cowpar's Dicaology.</i>	ib.
<i>And from Calderwood a rigid Presbyterian.</i>	8
<i>Popish Bishops, Priests, and Lay-men leave their Errors, and join in the work of Reformation.</i>	9
<i>The Names of some mentioned.</i>	10
<i>At the Reformation, there was no dispute about Parity among Ministers.</i>	11
<i>Presbyterians are challenged by Mr. Sage, to produce one instance for their side of the Question.</i>	12
<i>Calvin maintained not the unlawfulness of Prelacy.</i>	ib.
<i>Reformation when attempted and establish'd.</i>	ib.
<i>Superintendents vested with Episcopal Power.</i>	13
<i>Andrew Melvil the first Innovator, endeavours to introduce Presbtery.</i>	14
<i>A Conference arises hereupon.</i>	15
<i>The Design of the Innovators for a while frustrated.</i>	16
<i>The Presbyterian Parties arbitrary Proceedings against the Bishops.</i>	17
<i>Presbyterian Ministers invectives against the King, from the Pulpit.</i>	18
<i>The King removes all Jealousies of Affection to Popery.</i>	ib.
<i>Negative Confession drawn up.</i>	ib.
<i>The Presbyterians slander the King, and are very seditious.</i>	19
<i>Their Preachers silenced, some imprison'd, others flee from Scotland, for Rebellion.</i>	20
<i>Their abusive Language to the Bishops.</i>	21
<i>The King allows the Presbyterian Ministers to propose their Reasons.</i>	ib.
<i>Mr.</i>	Mr.

<i>Mr. John Spotswood's Testimony for Episcopacy.</i>	Page 22
<i>Melvil makes Disturbances.</i>	ib.
<i>Bishop of St. Andrews conven'd.</i>	23
<i>Hunter, a meer Lay-man, and Servant to Melvil pretends to be mov'd by the Spirit to excommunicate the Bishop and does so.</i>	ib.
<i>The Presbyterian Conclusion protested against by the Kings Commissioners.</i>	24
<i>The Chancellor's Opinion of the Presbyterian Spirit, that it would make them odious to the People.</i>	ib.
<i>The King expresses his abhorrence of their Proceedings.</i>	ib.
<i>The Presbyterian Ministers refuse to pray for the Conversion of the King's Mother.</i>	25
<i>John Cowpar not in Orders, takes Possession of the Pulpit before the Bishop of St. Andrews came, at the Instigation of the Presbyterian Ministers.</i>	ib.
<i>Annexation-Act destructive to Episcopacy.</i>	ib.
<i>King James recommends the repeal of it to his Son.</i>	26
<i>His Character of the Puritans and Caution to his Son concerning them, and their Practices; his Condemnation of Parity.</i>	ib.
<i>The Presbyterians grow insolent again, censure the Bishop of St. Andrews, oppose the King; their Hypocritical behaviour about the Ceremony of Unction.</i>	28
<i>They impose upon Mr. Pat. Adamson, when Bed-rid, and make him sign a Paper of abhorrence of Episcopacy.</i>	ib.
<i>He complains of the abuse, and asserts Episcopacy.</i>	30
<i>Another Character of the Presbyterians.</i>	ib.
<i>They demand an Establishment, Anno 1592, and their Proceedings on that Occasion.</i>	ib.
<i>The King averse to it, but forc'd to comply by reason of the public Distractions.</i>	31
<i>They then grow exceedingly seditious, and the King complains against their Declamations in the Pulpit.</i>	ib.
<i>They meddle with State-Affairs.</i>	ib.
<i>They send Hunter to be Chaplain to Bothwell the Rebel, and give the Money collected for Charity, to raise Soldiers against the King.</i>	32
<i>They vindicate Blake's cause against the King.</i>	33
<i>Rebellion preach'd from the Pulpits.</i>	ib.
<i>The King meditates the Restoration of Episcopacy.</i>	34
<i>The Presbyterians averse to have the point of Church-Government discuss'd.</i>	35
<i>The Clergy admitted to sit in Parliament.</i>	ib.
<i>The</i>	The

Contents of the Book.

<i>The Necessity of Imposition of Hands by Bishops urg'd, Anno 1598, as Calderwood owns.</i>	Page ib. Marg.
<i>Caveats admitted for the present, and why?</i>	36
<i>Nomination to Bishopricks.</i>	ib. & 37
<i>Mr. Drury a Learned Divine, his Approbation of Episcopacy express'd on his Death-bed, and requested by him to be notify'd.</i>	38
<i>The Majority of the Assembly concur with it.</i>	ib.
<i>Excommunication and Absolution is allow'd to be pronounc'd by the Bishop's Direction, Obedience is ordered to be sworn to the Bishops and Visitations held by them.</i>	39
<i>Ministers are to be suspended and deprived by Bishops.</i>	ib.
<i>Disputes about Equality or Inequality of Ministers prohibited, as making Schism in the Church.</i>	ib.
<i>The sum of what is said above.</i>	ib. 40
<i>The great Improbability that K. James should suffer his Children to be baptiz'd by Presbyterian Teachers, since true Bishops or Priests might be procur'd.</i>	41 & Marg.
<i>An account of the Baptisms of King James's Children, and particularly of Prince Charles's Baptism afterwards.</i>	42
<i>The last King of England, and a Blessed Martyr.</i>	43
<i>An Objection made against the Administrator of his Baptism, answer'd.</i>	44
<i>Reasons that make it highly probable that Lindsay was a true Bishop, when he baptiz'd Prince Charles.</i>	45
<i>However, he was a true Priest, and consequently an authorized Administrator of Baptism.</i>	47
<i>King Charles I. justly esteem'd a Blessed Martyr.</i>	49
<i>The Bishop of Sarum and the Dissenting Teachers ought to retract their Assertion, or defend it.</i>	50
<i>An Account annex'd of the Birth and Baptism of King CHARLES I. from the LYON-OFFICE at EDINGBOROUGH.</i>	

Contents of the P. S.

<i>The Church of Christ governed by Bishops for 1500 Years.</i>	56
<i>Primitive Episcopacy Diocesan.</i>	57
<i>Hartly's Vindication answer'd by Mr. Sturges.</i>	58
<i>Mr. Shaw's Shuffling.</i>	59
<i>Mr. Shaw a gross Plagiary.</i>	60
<i>Other's Men's Papers publish'd by Mr. Shaw under his own Name.</i>	61

ERRATA.

Page 44. Line 2. for *Nurricine*, read *Nurrice*, p. 48. l 17. Place * alter *Death*.